

# AUM

Point out the "Way"—however dimly,  
and lost among the host—as does the evening  
star to those who tread their path in darkness.  
—*The Voice of the Silence.*

## THE ARYAN PATH

---

VOL. V

OCTOBER 1934

No. 10

---

### THE LEADER OF TO-MORROW

World conditions to-day are topsy-turvy: The State should exist for the well-being of the citizen but it enchains him. Nationalism, which should provide a basis of education and broaden men's sympathies for and appreciation of his fellow-men abroad, erects boundaries, physical, economic and psychological, which produce greed, jealousy, hatred and war. The doctor who heals the body earns more than the teacher who educates the mind; but while the nature and habit of the mind are at least considered, the very existence of the Soul is ignored.

It is taken for granted that politico-economic problems are fundamental and causal, and therefore it is believed that human difficulties can be overcome and social diseases can be cured by legislation. "Practical" people do not realise that food, clothes, houses, etc., are not fundamental but secondary; are not in them-

selves the cause of human happiness and progress, but really effects of the unfoldment of soul-peace and expression of culture. Who dares to preach to-day, "Seek ye *first* the Kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you"? Asia, hypnotized and glamoured by the Occident, copies it, boldly and on a grand scale as Japan does, or as India, sheepishly but resentfully accepting her Westernization as if there were no way out.

Politics, economics and sociology represent realities of life, though in modern times they have been valued at too high a premium. The monks of Christendom and the faquirs of Asia, however, undervalue these realities—often they think them to be unreal and therefore valueless. Great Souls like Buddha and Plato or Tsongkhapa and Marcus Aurelius were truly spiritual, for



on the other hand, Buddhists who try to expound Gautama's teachings as pure rationalism deny that there can be any intimate connection between the doctrines of these two philosophers. Dr. Venkatrao, therefore, has done a service to the Buddha Society by taking this theme for his first lecture since he was elected in the place of the late Dr. Nair. He, however, did not touch upon the still debatable problem of the age of Sankara. Orientalists, generally speaking, assign the eighth century of the Christian era to Sankara. Orthodox Hindu opinion, believing in the records of various maths and especially of the Sringeri Math, are able to hold that he lived in the fourth and fifth centuries B. C. As Dr. Venkatrao pointed out, both the sages were preachers of Arya Dharma, the Religion of the Noble Ones, but addressing themselves to two different sets of people in two different parts of the great country of India, they used different modes of expression.

---

This however is not a solitary instance of its kind in the history of religions. The orthodox of every creed, supported by their priests, emphasise the apparent differences in the expositions of great teachers, claiming superiority for their own. The real unity of ideas which actually subsists is not merely overlooked—its very existence is not known. For example, how many rites and festivals has not Christianity borrowed from the pagans? Or, how many

know of the direct influence of Buddhist missionaries on the pre-Christian and early Christian religious movements? The comparative study of religions, has thrown considerable light on the similarity of teachings in many creeds. But in that field philologists are more active than philosophers; and discussion about words and etymology is more to the fore than examination of ideas and their evolution. Again, the modern scholar, in every department, starts with the conviction that human history began with the savage and that the roots of civilization are in barbarism. Therefore, every time ancient thoughts and institutions are studied they are viewed as mental babblings of child-humanity, albeit possessing the rude strength of the muscular giant. It is difficult, nay almost impossible, for the modern researcher to take the view that ancient Egyptians, Indians or Chinese may have been builders of cultures superior to our own; and that in the rise and fall of civilizations we may be encountering the remnants of some state or social order greater and better than twentieth century Europe and America. Not in common savagery did civilization commence but sages and thinkers have flourished in every age and cultured races have lived on earth at the same time as savage tribes, just as they do to-day. The study of ancient civilizations and of old religious and philosophical texts needs this new attitude—which implies a more reverential approach.



they possessed the primary yogic virtues of Viveka-discrimination and of Vairagya-detachment. Because they were Vairagis, souls who had freed their minds from the lure of desires and passions, they were able to evaluate correctly the things of this world. Events and objects of the material universe to them were concrete idols of ideal images. The material world, the historical events, were neither soulless shadows nor mere objective manifestations. The physical cosmos was valued as a reflection of the spiritual. Material objects were projections of spiritual ideas. Nations and races, states and kingdoms, were verities because of the spiritual reality within and behind them.

This view formed the very basis of the great philosophies of China, India and Greece—themselves but systems of thought rooted in what must have been once the universal Wisdom-Religion of the civilized world of the ancients. The restoration of this view would produce a mental revolution of the first magnitude. Materialism in science has received its deathblow, but materialism in philosophy is not an uncommon manifestation. Spiritual idealism is not yet clearly defined for practical application. Desire for religion—some kind of rational religion—is gathering force, which means desire for an idealistic philosophy which must give a new value since those given by organized religions have proven false or been found wanting. Who can produce this revolution save intellectuals who are also idealists?

We are not among those who see as imminent the collapse of Western civilization in the sense that savagery will follow the dark age which seems to be fast descending upon Europe. The decay and disintegration of civilizations take time, just as do their rise and growth. But the West is facing to-day a cataclysm due to persistence in old policies and programmes. These are now being abandoned; their substitutes are in the melting pot; liberalism in politics is almost drowned in the ocean of violence; and racial pride and national greed and class claims have produced autocracies. For all that, the still small voice of Spirit has not ceased its immortal action. The future is with the Idealist. He who ideates, creates. Ratiocination picks out the flaws, a very necessary task, and there is a marked manifestation of that faculty in these days. In a variety of ways people are taught how their civilization of machine-made plenty is breaking down. But not many are the creators and constructors of patterns for the new order.

The most important movement of the day for social reconstruction and the saving of civilization is that of education of the adult masses. Reformation of the schools of to-day will not much avail, because the dangers threatening civilization are imminent. The radio, the cinema, and the press are among the most important engines for the furthering of adult education, but these are run by the power of materialism. These

wonderful engines are put to ignoble uses. M. Edouard Herriot, former Prime Minister of France, whose work for many years as the Mayor of Lyons is well known, wrote about them thus:—

The news that is given to the public is itself coloured and doctored. How many Frenchmen are there to-day who have any accurate knowledge of the essential elements in what has been called "the Roosevelt experiment"? It is a sad thing to note that the powerful instruments that have been devised by science for the dissemination of knowledge have at times tended to serve and strengthen falsehood rather than truth.

Most poets, philosophers and art teachers are dependent upon these engines and often fall under their, at present, baneful influence.

The new teacher of the adult masses must ensoul himself with the pure spirit of idealism. Unless a sufficient number do that, the future of civilization will continue to be in danger.

Because of the general belief that adjustment from outside is the remedy, the real task of changing oneself within is grossly neglected. People shirk their own individual responsibility to life, to the state, to humanity, looking to governmental and other agencies to do something.

The Roman Church, typical of the embodiment of religious cunning and fanaticism, the Russian Soviets as representative of the reign of matter and machines, the Italian and German dictatorships, each standing for selfish nationalism and blatant race-pride, and other such agencies—all enslave

the mind, corrupt the heart and kill the soul of man. Therefore this era needs a few practical philosophers who will courageously strike at the root vice of competition in every department; for this they need to break their own fetters—personal ambition, class prejudice, nationalistic patriotism and racial pride; purifying their own lives they must act as priests of the Religion of Universal Brotherhood—instructors and friends of people the world over.

But they themselves will need models and patterns after which they may shape themselves. Archetypal Leaders called in the East Dhyani Buddhas are taken as models and patterns by Manushya or Human Buddhas; every Bodhisattva in endeavouring to become a Buddha, it is said, copies the example of a previous Buddha. Our new leaders cannot but fail if by groping in the dark they hope to muddle through into the light. They have to assimilate and embody wisdom and virtue, and one necessary way to self-training is contemplation on Ideal Leaders, Archetypal Leaders and their Ideal and Archetypal Knowledge. In the annals of humanity such Leaders shine like stars of the first magnitude in the firmament. Such leaders were Krishna, the Spiritual Director; Rama, the Ideal King; Gotama, the Supreme Teacher; Confucius, the Inspired Codifier; Jesus the Virile Reformer. In the words and examples of such Men the leader of to-morrow must seek guidance and nourishment.



## THE NAZI DELUSION

### ARYAN VERSUS SEMITIC

[Cecil Roth is a historian, and author of *The History of the Jews in Venice* and *A History of the Marranos*. In the following article he writes with intimate knowledge of his subject.]

The impress of religious beliefs on racial characteristics is a fascinating problem which has not yet been solved by the modern anthropologist or ethnologist. It is not, however, touched upon in this historical survey, which is convincing in its accurately logical deductions. We are here shown that a pure race—Aryan, Semitic, or any other—does not exist to-day. The *Gita* taught five thousand years ago that, in this Kali-yuga, caste is no longer pure; this is true of the Brahmanas and Chandalas of East and West alike. As the *Gita* points out, the true Aryan is distinguishable not by birth but by character.]

#### I

*The Middle Ages were nothing if not logical.* Mediæval Anti-Semitism was based, with unimpeachable rationalism, on religious grounds. The average European hated the Jew because he was an unbeliever: and, generally speaking, the Jew could escape the dislike and the discrimination to which he was subjected by the simple process of adopting Christianity. The "scientific" anti-Semitism which was born in Germany at the close of the nineteenth century, on the other hand, and which has reached its culminating point with the triumph of "Nazism," is based essentially on race (even though it may still be rooted, if one examines its origins sufficiently closely, in religion). It assumes a fundamental difference between the Jews (who belong to a "Semitic" stock, physically and morally inferior to the rest of the inhabitants of Europe) and their "Aryan" neighbours. Hence, as a natural

corollary, religion has nothing to do with the question. A Jew may be baptised, but he remains racially the same inferior being as he was before. A man with a single Jewish parent, or grandparent, or an even more remote intermixture of blood, is *ipso facto* contaminated, inferior to his "Nordic" neighbours, and thus unsuited for public employment. The attempts made to justify the new policy in the eyes of the world have resulted in the spread of this conception to other countries, where it was hitherto quite unknown.

Let us assume the validity of the Nazi diagnosis, of the fundamental difference between Jews and "Aryans". Even upon this assumption it is impossible to carry the theory to its logical extremity, for one simple reason: that (notwithstanding the current conception) the degree of admixture of blood in the course of the past generations has been so considerable that *there can be no German in whose*

*veins Jewish blood does not run, and few Jews who are absolutely free from any Gentile admixture.*

#### II

At the period of the decline of the Roman Empire, from which date the history of the Jews in Europe is continuous, their number throughout the whole world is estimated at a couple of million. Up to the beginning of the eighteenth century, as far as our statistical knowledge goes, this figure was virtually unchanged. This was in part due to the long succession of massacres and persecutions. But all Jews were not heroic: and some, when confronted with the alternatives of baptism or martyrdom, chose the former course. Every wave of oppression left in its train large numbers of Jewish converts to Christianity: unwilling and insincere, perhaps, in the first generation, but ultimately intermarrying with and becoming utterly assimilated in the general population. Nor was there lacking, in all countries and in all ages, a steady stream of converts who entered the dominant faith willingly, whether from conviction or from a lively sense of interest. At the time of the expulsion from England, for example, upwards of one hundred Jews and Jewesses sought refuge from the storm in the *Domus Conversorum* in London, ultimately intermingling with their Christian neighbours. There can be few Cockneys to-day in whose veins some tiny strain of the blood of these timid thirteenth-century Semites does not run.

The case was similar in Italy. In Apulia, entire Jewish communities were baptised by force at the close of the thirteenth century. Their descendants remained distinguishable for many generations, but in the end became completely absorbed. In Rome, thanks to the delicate conversionist machinery perfected by the Popes, no less than 2,500 Jews and Jewesses were forced to enter the Church in the single century 1650-1750. In other cities, the phenomenon was similar, though not quite so marked. Every precaution was taken to ensure that these apostates did not marry amongst themselves, and thus perpetuate the taint of disbelief.

In Spain, the wave of persecutions in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries drove tens—perhaps hundreds—of thousands into the dominant faith. I have described at length in my *History of the Marranos* the romance and the vicissitudes of the descendants of these unwilling converts. By the middle of the fifteenth century, there was barely a single aristocratic family of Aragon, from the royal house downwards, which was free from the taint of Jewish blood: and a certain jurist employed his leisure during a period of pestilence by drawing up genealogical lists demonstrating the precise Jewish antecedents of a very large proportion of contemporary notables—the so-called *Libro Verde de Aragon*. Conditions in Castile and, a little later, in Portugal were very similar. For a long time, some of the most aristocratic families did their best to maintain a pretence at



least of unsullied *limpieza*, or purity of blood "from any admixture of Jew or Moor," such as was boasted by Sancho Panza. The attempt was given up in Portugal at the close of the eighteenth century, when the Marquis de Pombal, with Oriental peremptoriness, gave orders privately to the heads of all the so-called "Puritan" houses that, within four months, they were to arrange matches for their daughters of marriageable age with members of families hitherto excluded from their circle, as being contaminated with Jewish blood!

A similar process is sometimes traceable in the most unexpected quarters. The British Museum and the John Rylands Library in Manchester both contain copies of a MS. entitled: *Critique du nobilaire de Provence... contenant l'épurement de la noblesse du pays*, in which the author (a certain Abbé Barcilon de Mouvans) traces in some outstanding noble families, two hundred years after the expulsion of the Jews from France, the blood of those who had preferred to remain in the country as professing Catholics. In Poland, the descendants of the followers of the rococo pseudo-Messiah, Jacob Frank, who embraced Christianity in the eighteenth century, may be discerned in the highest strata of Warsaw Society.

With the beginning of the age of tolerance, the process was accentuated rather than otherwise. Reference has hitherto been made in this article only obliquely to Germany where, the settlement of the

Jews having been continuous since classical times and their treatment peculiarly harsh, the number of conversions in the Middle Ages was probably greater than in any other country of northern Europe. In more recent times, long after other European nations had abandoned the practice, official Germany continued attempting to secure the highest possible number of conversions among the Jews—the only gate which opened for them the possibilities of a University or an official career. From the era of Frederick the Great to that of William the Small, there was a constant procession of wealthy Jews to the baptismal font. In Berlin, at the close of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth, under the influence of the temporising philosophy of the Mendelssohnian school, the defections took on the proportions of a veritable debacle, implicating according to some estimates one-third of the total Jewish population—some thousands of souls in all. Subsequent generations knew very little falling off. It is said that the total number of "half" and "quarter" New Christians (to adopt the Inquisitional nomenclature) who are affected by Herr Hitler's "Aryan" Law amounts to millions. Were the Inquisitional precedent to be followed to its extreme, and genealogies traced back a generation or two further, it is doubtful whether there would be enough pure-blooded Germans left to man even the S. A.

The admixture of blood, accor-

ding to report, is greater in the nobility and officer classes than in the ordinary *bourgeois*: for under the Empire it was a recognised practice for embryo Field Marshalls to recuperate the family fortunes by espousing the daughter of a wealthy Jewish banker. This, it is said, is the reason why the application of the "Aryan" paragraph to the Army was so long delayed. The account may perhaps seem exaggerated. Yet comparison with England, where the Jewish settlement is so much more recent, the Jewish population so much less numerous, and the inducements to baptism so much less pressing, shews that this is not the case. In the middle of the eighteenth century, intermarriage started on a small scale. It never became general: yet, to-day, it may be said that there are few families of the older nobility without some Jewish admixture or alliance. It is sufficient to instance the Dukes of Norfolk, Grafton, St. Albans, and Northumberland; the Marquesses of Crewe and of Winchester; Viscount Galway; the Earl of Rosebery, and so on, almost indefinitely. Families of the French nobility which contracted Jewish intermarriages include those of the Prince de Wagram, the Duc de Gramont, and the Prince de Richelieu: while the independent princely houses of Monaco and Liechtenstein are in the same category.

It is amazing in what unexpected quarters Jewish blood may be encountered. To illustrate the ubiquity of this "Semitic" ad-

mixture, one may mention persons so utterly dissimilar as Sir Henry Newbolt, the poet; William Booth, the Salvationist; and Erskine Childers, the Irish patriot. In the United States of America, conditions are very similar. A majority of the families who figure in the records of the handful of communities which existed in Colonial days have long since ceased to play any part in Jewish life: yet their descendants have not entirely died out. Later generations, too, contributed their quota to the melting-pot's alloy: and both Bret Harte and John Howard Payne were of comparatively recent Jewish extraction.

### III

Thus far, we have been dealing only with the question of Semitic admixture among the so-called "Aryans". But there is another side to the medal.

It is generally imagined that, with the growth of Christianity, proselytisation on the part of the Jews entirely ceased. This is not by any means correct. It slackened, indeed: but it continued uninterruptedly—sometimes, on a large scale. The eighth century witnessed the conversion to Judaism of the ruler, nobility and part at least of the people, of the Khazar State, situated in what is now the Ukraine and adjacent areas. For two centuries and more, they were a powerful element in European politics: and the Byzantine Emperor, Leon IV, was the son of a Khazar princess. It is conjectured that the quasi-Mongol-



ian features so common among the Jews of Eastern Europe even to-day denote descent from Khazar ancestors.

In the Western World, there were indeed no mass-conversions to Judaism. Nevertheless, there was a slow but steady infiltration; and earnest Churchmen never ceased complaining at the insidious influence which Judaism exerted upon simple Christian minds. In England, a "community of proselytes" is said to have been among the victims of the massacres of 1190. The statement is perhaps based upon a scribal error (*Gerim*, or proselytes, having been read for *Garim*, sojourners): but the fact that it obtained credence is in itself significant. In 1215, a Deacon was burned alive at Oxford for having simultaneously embraced Judaism and a Jewish wife. In 1275, a Dominican Friar joined the Jewish fold, causing great scandal and proving one of the immediate pretexts for the Expulsion of 1290. Notorious, too, was the case of Jurnet, the Jew of Norwich, who in the reign of Henry II espoused a Christian heiress, the daughter of Robert de Haville. Considering that apostasy from Catholicism was at that time, and long after, a capital offence, it stands to reason that there must have been many more converts, even in England, who managed to conceal their crime—particularly among the ordinary people.

So also on the Continent. Jewish history preserves the names of a long succession of proselytes, who even in the Middle Ages dared all,

and sometimes lost all, for the sake of the God of Abraham. In Carolingian France, much scandal was caused by the conduct of the Deacon Bodo, who, having received permission from the Empress to go on pilgrimage to Rome, retired instead with his nephew to Saragossa, where he embraced Judaism, assumed the name Eleazar, and espoused a Jewess. At the beginning of the eleventh century, a persecution was caused on the Rhineland through the conversion of a priest named Wecelin. When the age of massacre started in Germany, with the First Crusade, quite a number of the victims were recent proselytes. Thus, among those killed in Cologne in the outbreak on the eve of Pentecost, 1096, there was included (according to the detailed lists preserved in the *Memorbuch* of Nuremberg) an unnamed proselyte, besides Hezecha, daughter of Mar Judah, and their two daughters. There is abundant proof that these were not by any means the only converts to Judaism living in Germany at the time.

So also in later history. Not all of the Marranos who escaped to declare their Judaism in Amsterdam, London, or New York were of pure Jewish descent. Names like those of Nicholas Antoine and of Johann Peter Spaeth, who became whole-hearted adherents of the Jewish faith, continually recur in Jewish history. Finally, with the growth of tolerance and of social intercourse, mixed marriage became more and more common. In most cases, the offspring was

probably lost to Judaism: but in many instances it was the Gentile partner who succumbed to the attraction.

Once more, let us take England as typical. Even before the re-admission of the Jews under the Commonwealth, a few Englishmen and women, who had carried their Bible-loving Puritanism to its logical extreme, went over to Amsterdam and entered the Jewish fold. In the registers of the cemetery of the Spanish and Portuguese community in Amsterdam there are recorded between 1623 and 1625 alone the burials of the wife and three children of English proselytes. John Evelyn, when he was in Holland in 1641, encountered an Englishwoman married to a Burgundian Jew, "a merry-drunken fellow," who had translated the liturgy into English for her benefit. In the London Jewry of the Restoration, quite a number of proselytes figured—Belamy, the wine-cooper of Seething Lane; Deborah Israel, who left her property to the Synagogue in 1669; and others. Late in the eighteenth century, the community received its most illustrious son by adoption in the eccentric Lord George Gordon, formerly head of the Protestant Association. In the provinces, conditions must have been very similar: it is sufficient to recall the romantic match between Moses Abrahams of Poole, and the buxom Martha Haynes, daughter of a Dorset farmer, from which the Right Honourable Sir Herbert Samuel, M. P., is said to be descended. Outstanding proselytes

of the nineteenth century included Ada Isaacs Menken the friend of Swinburne and of Dickens and of Charles Reade—and, *mirabile dictu*, the Countess of Charlemont.

#### IV

I have paid particular attention to England in this connexion simply because the ground to be examined is comparatively small and the records easily accessible. A case more imposing by far could be made out for many continental countries, where the residence of the Jew has been more protracted and his numbers are greater. In Russia, for example, the last few years have witnessed the conversion to Judaism of thousands of the *subbotnikow* who started as Sabbatarians and ended as whole-hearted followers of the Mosaic code. These have done no more than continue the tradition of the Judaizing Heretics, who in the fifteenth century threatened the existence of the Russian Church. In America, India and Africa there are large numbers of dark skinned Jews who are plainly of non-Semitic origin.

It is not suggested for one moment that these proselytes to Judaism ever attained really considerable numbers, save in one or two exceptional cases. But the numerical importance is beside the point, in an age when a responsible European government insists on probing the ancestry of its subjects for many generations back. The question is, after all, one of arithmetical progression. A single individual born a century ago may to-



day have upwards of a hundred descendants: the blood of a couple who lived a thousand years ago may to-day run in the veins of millions. The Jews are comparatively a pure race. Yet there can be few among them who do not count among their ancestry some "proselyte of righteousness" of four, or ten, or twenty generations ago: and the blood of the converts who suffered at Cologne in 1096 may to-day permeate the whole of German Jewry.

Conversely, an enormously high proportion of the German people—certainly no less than ten per cent—could boast, if they desired it, some traceable Jewish strain; while, save in the most remote country

districts, there can be few individuals in the country who are entirely free from such an admixture. Nature, with her usual quiet humour, reminds us forcibly of this fact by the blond "Nordic" types which abound among the German Jews and by the swarthy, dark-skinned types who may be encountered in the general population of the country—even among those who stand highest in the counsels of the Nazi party. General Goering should beware against pushing his genealogical enquiries too far. One of these days it may perhaps be discovered that Adolf Hitler and Albert Einstein have a common ancestor! And what will the Nazi party do then?

CECIL ROTH

*How, O Krishna, can we be happy hereafter, when we have been the murderers of our race? What if they, whose minds are depraved by the lust of power, see no sin in the extirpation of their race, no crime in the murder of their friends, is that a reason why we should not resolve to turn away from such a crime—we who abhor the sin of extirpating our own kindred? On the destruction of a tribe the ancient virtue of the tribe and family is lost; with the loss of virtue, vice and impiety overwhelm the whole of a race. From the influence of impiety the females of a family grow vicious; and from women that are become vicious are born the spurious caste called Varna Sankar. Corruption of caste is a gate of hell, both for these destroyers of a tribe and for those who survive.—BHAGAVAD-GITA, I, 37-42.*

## JULIAN THE APOSTATE

### A THEOSOPHIST OF THE FOURTH CENTURY

[N. Narasimha Moorthy, M.A., B.L., is the Librarian of Mysore University. He is greatly interested in music and in the mystic side of all religious philosophies.—EDS.]

That Julian was a man of remarkable gifts both of mind and character is conceded by all who have studied his career. Says Cardinal Newman:—

Take him all in all, and I cannot but recognize in him a spacious beauty and nobleness of moral deportment which combines in it the rude greatness of Fabricius or Regulus with the accomplishments of Pliny or Antoninus. His simplicity of manners, his frugality, his austerity of life, his singular disdain of sensual pleasure, his military heroism, his application to business, his literary diligence, his modesty, his clemency, his accomplishments, as I view them, go to make him one of the most eminent specimens of Pagan virtue which the world has ever seen.

Nevertheless, to Newman, Julian is an evil name in history, because he renounced his allegiance to Christianity. To Gibbon, who does full justice to Julian as ruler, the blend of Greek philosophy and Eastern mysteries, which the emperor endeavoured to substitute in the place of Christianity, was an unnatural alliance between philosophy and superstition. Even Cotter Morison, a writer of rare discrimination and sympathy, finds it difficult to avoid a certain intellectual disdain for the reactionary emperor. And yet, as Dill says, it was no ordinary man who dreamt of regenerating the ancient wor-

ship by borrowing dogmatic theology from Alexandria, an ecstatic devotion from Persia, and a moral ideal from Galilee.\* Nor is it difficult to find rational grounds for the apostasy of Julian from the Christian religion and for his partiality for the Eastern systems of worship. It is the object of this paper to indicate briefly these grounds and to note a few of the essential features of Julian's religious reform, which is not without significance and interest at the present day.

Born in 332, A. D., Julian had the good fortune of having as his teacher Mardonius. Mardonius imbued his pupil with his own passion for Greek poets and philosophers, especially Plato and Aristotle, and further impressed on him the value of not merely strenuous thinking but of purity of living. In his seventeenth year, Julian came under the influence of Libanius, who introduced him to Neoplatonism. A few years later he was allowed to spend some time in Athens, where he renewed his study of Greek philosophy and was probably initiated into the Eleusinian Mysteries. It may also be noted that in Athens Julian made the acquaintance of Basil and Gregory, later eminent as Saints and Fathers

\* *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*, p. 101.



of the Church, yet Platonists at heart.

In his twenty-fifth year, Julian was declared Cæsar by the Emperor, and sent to Gaul which had been overrun by fierce hordes of Germans. In this new task Julian proved to the world that his devotion to Plato and the Greek poets had not rendered him unfit for practical life. He soon cleared the land of its invaders and then applied himself to the more congenial work of restoring order and peace in the half-ruined land. The scanty harvests were made good by the importation of corn from abroad. An impetus was given to agriculture, manufactures and commerce. The spirit of industry revived again. Julian personally revised the proceedings of the provincial governors. The rigour of the law was mitigated. Taxes were made both lighter and easier to collect, and the rapacity of inferior agents was checked. Civil corporations became again active. Public and private festivals were celebrated with due pomp and splendour.

The same spirit of beneficent reform continued to inspire Julian when he became sole emperor. The imperial court was thoroughly reformed. Corruption was put down. The Senate was treated with marked respect and consideration and, as far as possible, not merely the form but the spirit of republican tradition was maintained. Unjust and pernicious exemptions enjoyed by certain classes of citizens were abolished, and they were made to feel that the service of the state was binding

on all. In his private life which was a model of purity and severe self-denial, and in his unceasing application to public business, the Emperor himself set an example for others to follow. What, however, mattered most to Julian was the great truth of "the presence and the glory of the gods" which are ultimately one, and he spared himself no pains to bring home this truth to his subjects.

As might have been expected from one who was steeped in the philosophy of Plato, Aristotle and Plotinus, all "partisans of the One,"—Julian was a decided monotheist. Though denounced as an apostate, he sympathized with Christianity in so far as its monotheism coincided with his own. Nor did he fail to appreciate the beauty of its moral teaching. His hostility was not to Christianity, as such, but to the other-worldliness of its followers, which, to borrow the words of T. H. Green, in its aspiration after heaven, left earth to its chance. The chief representatives of this religion regarded citizenship as inconsistent with Christian obedience, and it could hardly be expected that the ruler of a mighty state and the student of Plato and Aristotle, with whom good life was synonymous with citizenship, should look with favour on a creed which prevented men of ability and virtue from engaging themselves in the service of the commonwealth. In the second place, believing as he did that God is the common King and Father of all, and that He reveals Himself as

much in the political and social institutions of mankind as in the soul of man, Julian could not but regard as at once narrow and unphilosophical the Christian conception of a God who consulted only the interests of a particular race, and took no providential care for human interests like those of political and social order.\*

Julian's partiality for the Eastern religions which found their way into the Empire can also be easily explained. When Rome expanded from a city-state into an empire, the inadequacy of the old national religion to meet the new conditions made itself felt, and its place was taken by Stoicism, which, by its emphasis on the unity and equality of mankind, suited very well the cosmopolitan character of the Empire. Stoicism, however, in its turn, was found wanting when it was confronted with the striking revival of religious sentiment in the second and third centuries. Consequent on this religious awakening, there was both among the cultivated minds and the masses an intense longing for mystic communion with the divine and for the continuance of life beyond the grave. This spiritual craving Stoicism found itself unable to satisfy, and this for two reasons. In the first place it was too severely critical of all emotional displays. Its key-note was not so much one of exaltation as of renunciation, and even in the famous hymn† of

Cleanthes to Zeus, there is more of sublime resignation than of the spiritual rapture which one finds in a Plotinus or a St. Paul. Secondly, the loftiest exponents of Stoicism either, like Epictetus, denied the immortality of the soul, or, like Marcus Aurelius, wavered in their attitude towards it. Thus it came about that men turned for spiritual satisfaction to the Eastern cults which aroused and cultivated ecstatic devotion and held out the hope of future life. It is undoubtedly true that these cults were in their earlier stages tinged with superstition and loose magic practices. But, as it has been well observed, the idealism of humanity, by a strange alchemy, can transmute even the most unpromising materials.‡ The Eastern faiths, when brought into contact with the higher influences of the time, purged themselves of their impure associations and, helped by the syncretism of the time, developed a distinct tendency to monotheism, stressed the kinship of the human with the divine, and in their mysteries, which were permeated by the ideas of purification and communion, embodied the finest side of the old pagan piety. And fortified and interpreted by Neoplatonism, the dominant philosophy, they made an irresistible appeal to high and low. The purest and most powerful of these faiths was that of Mithra, the Sun-God.§ It was imported into the empire from

\* Whittaker: *Neo-Platonists* (Second Ed.) Chap. VIII.

† There is a translation of this beautiful hymn in *Vitality of Platonism* by J. Adam.

‡ Dill—*Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*.

§ "It was a fine and manly religion," says Dean Inge in his *Philosophy of Plotinus* (Vol. I. p. 45), "spurring men to action, guiding them by its discipline, and teaching them to live honourably, cleanly, and even holily."



Cilicia, and as the religion specially favoured by the Roman army, it spread throughout the empire and proved to be the most formidable rival of Christianity. It laid hold on Julian and became the vital centre of his religious system.

Julian was not the only ruler who felt the fascination of Sun-worship. Our own Akbar offered, as is well known, his homage to the Sun and there is evidence to show that he knew the *Sūrya-sahasranāma* very well.\* Seventeen hundred years before Julian, the Egyptian king, Ikhanaton, made solar monotheism the religion of the state and sang the praises of the Sun-God, Aton: "the sole God, beside whom there is no other, the Creator of all lands, of all mankind, and solely beneficent." What, however, is characteristic of Julian is that he supplies a philosophical basis to his creed. The summit is pure theism, based on the Plotinian conception of God as the absolute One, "who in His hidden nature as source, is a unity of all Reality, and who by an overflow of His superabundant riches is manifested through the thought-forms, or mind-aspects, of the universe, and secondly, through the energies of life and love and will that are summed up in the Over-Soul".† The "gods" of different religions are the manifestations of the One under conditions of form, time and personality and, as such,

are worthy of reverence. The world of sense is a manifestation, or phenomenal expression, of the One, and the sun is worthy of homage, partly because he is the source of life and light in the visible universe and, chiefly, because he is the most fitting symbol of the One who is the source of all existence and all knowledge. And Julian distinctly suggests that worship offered to the sun is in reality worship offered to the Spiritual Sun of whom the solar orb is the symbol or image.‡ Lastly, the sun, though it is the source of life and light in this universe, is not to be identified with either. In like manner, Plato, Julian's favourite master, bids us regard the supreme Idea or Idea of the Good as "beyond existence" and "above knowledge," though it is the source of all existence and all knowledge.§

The myths, associated with the old systems of worship were to be allegorized in an edifying and philosophical manner. To borrow an illustration from the book "On the Gods and the World," by Sallustius, the friend of Julian, the myth of Kronos swallowing his children is to be interpreted as follows:—Since God is intellectual, and all intellect returns unto itself, this myth expresses the true essence of God,§ The interpretation of these myths was to be the work of a separate class of priests who

were also expected to conduct regular services, administer sacraments and generally offer spiritual counsel to their flock. Definite instructions are laid down for their guidance. They should be pure in body and mind. Their conversation should be chaste, their diet temperate, their friends of honourable reputation. Since their learning should be suited to their sacred profession, they should devote themselves to the study of the systems of Pythagoras, Plato, and the Stoics. They should be unceasing in doing works of charity and beneficence. It will be observed how closely this ideal corresponds with the ancient Hindu and Buddhist ideal of priesthood. In the ideal city of Sri Ramachandra, as depicted by Valmiki, the Brahmins are represented as men who had subdued their senses and were devoted to the study and teaching of the sacred books and zealous in the performance of their regular duties which included the duty of helping others. The Buddhist monk was expected not only to perfect himself, but to send out thoughts of love in all directions, and to pro-

mote the good of others whenever opportunity presented itself.

Ikhanaton, to whom reference has already been made, abounded in zeal but lacked tolerance. When he established Sun-worship in the land he abolished the existing cults and erased even the names of all other deities, and he did this, it must be said to his honour, without shedding blood. Julian, on the other hand, conceded the widest possible toleration to other faiths, and forbade the use of violence. Thus he showed a true philosophic spirit not merely in the convictions which he held, but in the temper with which he held them.

Above all, religion was not to be divorced from politics. The monarchy was to be that of the Antonines, working in as republican a spirit as possible and having for its fundamental principle the good of the governed. How manfully Julian strove to act up to this ideal has already been pointed out, and it is no exaggeration to say that of all later Roman emperors Julian comes nearest to Marcus Aurelius in realizing on the throne Plato's ideal of philosopher-king.

N. NARASIMHA MOORTHY

\* See the *Indian Historical Quarterly*, May 1933.

† Rufus M. Jones: *Pathway to the Reality of God*, p. 230.

‡ It is hardly necessary to remind the reader that the Hindus' sacred prayer, *Gayatri* is addressed to the "Light that enlightens our understandings".

§ In his *Republic*.

§ See Gilbert Murray, *Five Stages of the Greek Religion*.



## YOUTH AT THE CROSSROADS

[The Hon. Franklin Chase Hoyt possesses an intimate knowledge of his subject. He is Presiding Justice of the New York City Children's Court, which he was instrumental in organizing, and has been prominent in many movements for the benefit of American youth, including the Big Brother Movement, which he served as President for fourteen years.]

One solution which he proposes for the problem of youthful lawlessness—the inculcation through the schools of the principles of ethical culture, divorced from sectarianism—has a wider application than to the U.S.A. Everywhere the demand for ethical, *i. e.*, religious culture freed from the control of the priest, is growing. More and more it is being recognized that the nearer a youth is to church or temple, the further away from spiritual verities he is likely to be. Not the temple but the *Gita*, not the church but the poems of Shelley, not the mosque but the mystical writings of Rūmi. The youth should be taught, and he is eager to learn, the lessons not of any infallible Bible, but of such books which inspire him to be soul-reliant, and an intelligent lover not of any sect or section of the people but of the race as a whole. The cause of Religion as against religions needs active and sagacious missionaries, and such unsectarian religious education constitutes the very first step towards lasting peace and good will among the nations of the world.—EDS.]

Is American youth more lawless to-day than it was in the past, and is it becoming more anti-social in its attitude and conduct? Is there a definite increase of crime among the younger generation, and are our modern criminals more youthful than those of bygone days? These are questions which are being asked insistently throughout our land and which are raising the gravest apprehensions among all who have the future welfare of our country at heart. Yet like many other questions and problems they seem rather to suggest a situation or condition which calls for consideration than to present a definite query susceptible of a direct answer. For, if the subject were approached from one particular angle based upon statistics and past experience, the response, I believe, would be an emphatic "No". If, on the other hand, the problem

were considered from the viewpoint of the general social situation and the existing collapse of former standards and restraints, a different verdict might be rendered; for no one can gainsay that the present generation is treading new and precarious paths and that it is rapidly breaking away from the conventions and traditions of the past.

As to the specific assertion which is so often made these days that crime is on the increase among youth in America, let us consider such evidence as is available. It must be confessed that no one really knows whether the average age of all those convicted of crime has increased or decreased during the past twenty-five, fifty or one hundred years, as unfortunately there were no records kept in past times which might afford a satisfactory means of comparison with

those of the present day. The only competent survey of the subject of which I know is one recently made by a bureau of the Federal Government which showed that between ten given years the average age of youthful offenders incarcerated in our prisons and penitentiaries had slightly increased or, in other words, that the young delinquent of to-day is a trifle older than his prototype of ten years ago. From my own experience I can say this: during the past twenty-five years I have handled over sixty thousand cases of juvenile delinquency (as well as about forty thousand cases of neglected children), and I know from the carefully compiled records of the Children's Court of New York City that there has been a decided falling off during that period in the numbers arraigned before the court for offences which, if committed by adults, would have been crimes. The "curve of delinquency" has not always been constant—it has varied from time to time for certain reasons—but it shows conclusively that delinquency was at a far lower ebb in 1933 than it was in 1908. The reports of other juvenile courts in the country evince the same trend, and all the data which we possess on the subject definitely indicate a decline of anti-social conduct on the part of the adolescent offender during the past ten or twenty years.

As against these encouraging records the pessimists point to the large number of youthful criminals in our prisons and claim that this fact in itself proves that the younger

generation has cast all regard and respect for law and order to the winds. But does this fact really prove any decided moral retrogression on its part? It is true that our prisons are full of young people and it is a deplorable situation which every thoughtful person deprecates. Nevertheless, it is hardly a novel condition or one which has been engendered only during the present era. Throughout the ages, youth has ever been an attribute and distinctive trait of the criminal. The convicts of a hundred years ago were probably as young if not younger than are the prisoners of to-day. The highwayman, the footpad and the desperado of the past were no older than the gunman, the gangster and the racketeer of 1934. Over a century ago commentators were deploring the prevalence of youthful criminals. The mere fact, therefore, that our criminal population at present includes so many youthful offenders, unfortunate and disturbing though it be, hardly proves in itself that the youth of to-day is more lawless than were their prototypes of long ago. The only real evidence which we have, shows that actual law-breaking by the adolescent offender has declined in recent years; and upon the specific charge that there has been a marked increase of criminality, our younger generation would seem to be entitled to a verdict of acquittal.

This, then, is one side of the picture. There unfortunately is another which is considerably more perplexing and less reassuring.



There can be no question but that American youth is being affected by the tremendous changes which the world has experienced since the beginning of the century, and especially by the upheavals, the unrest and the depression since the War. Old barriers have fallen and new standards have been set up; old safeguards have been wiped out and new codes of independence and licence have taken their place. Parental authority is becoming atrophied, and religious education and training are not the force for restraint and discipline that they once were. The effect of modern inventions such as the automobile, the movie and the radio has been to transform family life completely, while the disappearance of rural simplicity, the congestion of the cities and the exigencies of the machine age have well-nigh obliterated the old fashioned home of former years. As a result of all these things the young people of to-day have an entirely different point of view from that of the children of the previous age. They are more independent, more self-reliant and less tolerant of all authority and discipline. It is too early as yet to appraise the effect of all these changes and upheavals upon their development but a situation is presented which already is surcharged with foreboding and uncertainty and which calls for immediate attention if the morale of the younger generation is to be upheld.

Never in our history has there been greater need than there is at present for a reconsideration of the

objectives which are essential and vital in the proper training of youth and in developing and conserving its moral sense. The great trouble with past methods has been that they have failed to counteract lawlessness and anti-social conduct in their early stages. We are now beginning to realize that habit formation begins with infancy and that character is developed to a great degree in the tenderest years of life. If a child is to be taught self-control and respect for authority such training should not be delayed until its tendencies and impulses have become firmly established and its habits and proclivities deeply rooted. In other words, our programme must stress the need of prevention as paramount to the problem of correction and punishment. This, of course, does not mean that we should neglect the latter; society is now trying out various ways and means of correcting the actual offender and should, and probably will, improve its methods by degrees in the future. But in social therapy, as in medicine, preventive measures to establish general sanitary conditions and to halt the spread of disease and contagion are more important than the cure of an individual.

The first agency upon which dependence must be placed to train and guide the child in the right direction from its very infancy is naturally the parent. Good or bad, strong or weak, reliable or incompetent, the parents cannot be ignored for they are entrusted by nature with both the

opportunity and the duty of controlling the child in the first instance by their authority, and of moulding the child's earliest mental and moral development by their guidance. Modern parents are none too well equipped for this task but they are not altogether to blame for being disconcerted and distraught by the upset conditions of the times. In reality they are to-day almost as much in need of training and instruction as are the children, but much can be done to help them to discharge their duties intelligently and to fit them to take their proper place as the vanguard in the fight against the maladjustment of youth. Parent-leagues, community centres and other educational agencies have done something in this direction and their influence should be greatly broadened and extended. Mental clinics and child-guidance bureaus should be established in every community so that problem and difficult children can be properly studied and their parents instructed in the methods to be followed in their training. The State should insist on a thorough physical examination of children at frequent intervals and not wait, as at present, until they are actually suffering from neglect before taking remedial measures. Indeed, when we come to consider the subject of the improvement and supervision of parental guidance, innumerable plans and suggestions spring to mind, some radical and others conservative, some of which have already been started and others of which still belong to the

realm of speculation. Space naturally forbids any detailed discussion of these absorbing topics, but it is obvious that the steps which we may take in this direction in the future will have a tremendous influence upon the mettle of the coming generation.

The second agency which must be relied on to train our future citizens is the school, and it is here that new concepts and objectives are imperatively needed. Through the schools must march all children on their road to maturity, and if all such institutions would only remodel their systems, as some to their great credit are already doing, they could accomplish more than any other factor in stamping out lawlessness in its early stages and in successfully preparing the men and women of to-morrow for the battles of life. To this end they should all adopt a new psychology of education which should concern itself not so much with the acquisition of book-learning as with the development of social efficiency. They should provide for the vocational guidance of their pupils and pay special attention to the needs of the backward, the unadjusted and the unsuccessful. They should see that the problem child is given the benefit of psychiatric study and that every available agency is invoked which can assist in its readjustment, for it has been proven beyond question that the problem child of the school becomes the delinquent of the future. They should keep in active touch with the child's experiences and activ-



ities outside of school, its home and its environment, to the end that the child's attitude and reactions may be understood and a proper programme adopted for its guidance. In short, education should be regarded as a scientific controller of human behaviour and accordingly the whole school curriculum should be directed towards moulding the child into a happy, useful and reliable member of the social order.

There is one thing more that schools should do—and that is to establish courses of ethical training in order that the morals and ideals of the coming generation may be developed and conserved. It is in this connection that something concrete and specific could be inaugurated to guide the thoughts and impulses of youth in the right direction and to combat loose thinking and anti-social conduct. In the past, America has depended on the various re-

ligious agencies, through their Sunday-schools and the like, to give moral instruction to the young, and when these agencies have failed to reach the children as a whole, no substitute has been supplied to carry on the work. Sectarianism has been banished from our public schools and there is no suggestion of its revival, but there is a crying need for something which we lack to-day by which every child may be privileged to receive some kind of education in morality and may be taught how to think rightly and to act honourably. It is only through the schools that this may be accomplished comprehensively, and if they would but rise to the situation and revise their concepts of education so as to include the principles of ethical culture, America would have less cause to worry about the lawlessness of the coming generation.

FRANKLIN CHASE HOYT

## WILL AND WISH

[J. D. Beresford writes about the type of yoga which would suit the Westerner, with the assumption that the path of the Eastern yogi is not suitable. There prevails a great deal of confusion about Eastern and Western occultism and mysticism. The human soul is neither Oriental nor Occidental, any more than it is male or female. Two systems of yoga have been generally known and their variants are numerous. Hatha Yoga is not exclusively bodily asceticism, much less bodily torture; concentration on the body can take many forms—the eating of certain kinds of food only, breathing exercises of particular types, exercise of muscle and nerve through posture and movement, etc. Thus Eurythmics may be described as a form of Hatha Yoga.]

Raja Yoga has as its central aim purification and development of soul qualities, which naturally produce, without special effort, bodily rhythm and poise. A poised body does not necessarily mean a poised mind, but a poised mind in course of time is bound to produce poise of body. Four books may be recommended to the aspirant for Raja Yoga—*The Voice of the Silence*, *Light on the Path*, *The Bhagavad-Gita* and *The Dhammapada*. The first two are likely to appeal most to the modern man—be he Easterner or Westerner. True Raja Yoga deals with the whole of man and advocates training of the inner members first. Another way of distinguishing between Hatha and Raja Yoga is this: the former advocates separation of soul from the body, of the human individual from the social order to which he belongs; Raja Yoga advocates the assuming of responsibility towards its vehicles of mind and body by the Inner Soul, and to his family, nation and race by the man. Hatha Yoga involves running away from the world; Raja Yoga transforms it into a Garden of Eden.—Eds.]

Anyone who continually turns his attention to seeking the manifestations of the spirit through matter will inevitably meet with indications that may be made the basis of a broad generalisation. Ultimately such generalisations will fail, giving place before a deeper understanding of the mysteries. But on this temporal, spatial plane of being the recognition of these relative truths as embracing symbols, serves a practical and instructive purpose.

That this should be so is an inevitable deduction from the simple premise that spirit is the only reality, an immanent, transcendent unity which cannot be directly apprehended by the intellect, but whose existence may be

inferred as the single cause of all material phenomena. From that premise we must draw the inevitable inference that however diverse may be the phenomena, they must exhibit some points of likeness since all of them are representations of the same moulding force proceeding from spirit through life and consciousness. Our search for unity must be prosecuted by way of tortuous and perplexing paths, and in the earlier stages of the ardent ascent we are warranted in accepting indications that serve to point a direction, even if they must finally be left behind us. And one such indication has recently forced itself upon my attention in the guise of a differentiation between will and wish.



Now like all abstract terms carrying a significance of which we grasp only the more superficial aspects, these two words are very loosely used in ordinary speech. They are, indeed, sometimes accepted as being practically synonymous. Wherefore I propose in the first place to indicate as clearly as possible the definition I must impose upon them in what follows, beginning with "will" as being the more intellectual concept.

It is obvious in the first place that "will" is only a derivative of "wish," and is a function of the mind consciously exercised for a definite and clearly visualised purpose. It may be creative or merely resistant, the former being the more productive, the latter the more circumscribing form. But in either aspect its general effect is produced by the deliberate inhibition of those sides of the personality which are recognised as offering obstruction to the achievement of the desired purpose. To take an extreme case, a man greatly ambitious of worldly success will inhibit all those tendencies the expression of which would handicap him in the achievement of his career, no matter whether those tendencies are representative of natural affection, conformation to an accepted code of ethics, or such bodily desires as those for the common satisfaction of the senses by eating, drinking, sexual indulgence, or even relaxation of effort. The direction of all such inhibitions is towards a kind of asceticism attained by the dominating power of the reason. Whatever part wish

may have played in the conception of the original purpose, it is not the chief instrument by which such purpose will be attained. The mind is in supreme control; and of the many wishes that will necessarily come into consciousness, only one is accepted and the remainder rejected. Wherefore "will" as here defined is a function of the conscious mind, the agent of reason.

"Wish" is a far more subtle essence, and assumes a multitude of disguises. It is closely allied with consciousness, not only that of which we are aware, but also of those consciousnesses that derive from other bodily centres, of which we have little or no personal realisation. And this generative impulse may either use the reason or subdue it, since it represents not a function of the mind but of the personality. Thus it may support the will's control, as in the example cited above, or may undermine it. In any case "wish" is always primary and "will" secondary. We do not will that for which we have no desire. As the old Hermetists say, "Behind will stands desire."

The difference in action of these two forces has been very clearly illuminated for me, recently, in the study I have been making of mental healing. It is a commonplace that mind has control of the body, but that is a very misleading statement. Mind in its relation with will has, in fact, exceedingly limited powers over the functions and almost none over the organs of the body. As a subject for faith or

mental healing, the man of considerable intellect and determination is an almost hopeless case. Reason is necessarily a fallible guide in almost any connection, and when we are dealing with matters of the spirit, which has been assumed as inhabiting every cell of the body, the highest intelligence is hopelessly inefficient. Indeed, it may be laid down almost as an axiom, founded not only upon inner knowledge but upon observed and recorded fact, that a faith held only by the conscious mind can never work any of those "miracles" of healing, which are being so frequently performed in the West at the present time.

Perhaps the chief reason for this is that such a faith, whether religious or not, involves an element of contradiction, since it is not shared by the other components of the personality. As a consequence these unincluded elements must be sternly inhibited by an act of will, an act that stimulates opposition in the repressed desires and produces a separation of the personality. And as it is only by winning the co-operation of the subconsciousness that any remarkable cure can be obtained, the purely intellectual faith that cannot admit such co-operation offers an almost insuperable bar to the healer.

On the other hand "wish," if it be pure in origin, works not by opposing other elements of the personality but by absorbing them, and thus, reinforced and single, it will find expression. Reason and

will cannot stand for a moment before this alliance. We see aspects of the working of this principle in obsession and religious conversion. In the former case, the wish is not "pure in origin," and does not represent the whole personality, achieving manifestation because the intelligence and will are comparatively feeble. In the second case the subliminal uprush is often due to earlier repressions by the will, and rarely flows from the true fount of wisdom.

To define that source would take me beyond the scope of Western psychology, but I have, personally, no shadow of doubt that it is to be found in the true ego, the experienced individual spirit which becomes all powerful by development, although it finds so weak an expression in the average European of to-day. Nevertheless, we can make an application of the principle involved, in relation to an object so impure in origin as success in business. This can never be an expression of the whole personality, even as it is known to the psychologist. The "unconscious," (I use the word as commonly understood in psycho-analysis), cannot be interested in success of this kind. That strange, suggestible entity, Maeterlinck's "Unknown Guest," can be induced to collaborate for some purposes but not for others\*; and it knows nothing of, and cannot be educated in, the technique of money-making. This is not to say that this assum-

\* See in this connection Jung's masterly analysis of the Chinese Tao in *The Secret of the Golden Flower*.



ed "unconscious mind" exhibits a general ethical tendency. We find in it the sexual, unsocial and feral desires that spring from the lower centres. It is sometimes regarded as a wild beast that must be tamed by cage and whip. But it does not, and cannot be made to, understand the language of worldly ambition.

Now the wider application I have been seeking from these comparatively simple deductions is to the two most easily recognisable ways of Yoga. I speak of them as two only, because although the methods employed may subdivide them so that they follow recognisably different paths, fundamentally they fall into those two categories that I have here headed—Will and Wish.

The first works by way of the mind. The impulse to development, as I have assumed above, necessarily lies deeper than the intelligence, but the expression of that impulse is sought by the mastery of the mind over the body. This is the common way of the Fakir, as it was, also, of the mediæval ascetic. By the steady development of the power of thought, through meditation and intense concentration, every desire of the body is subdued and ultimately killed. Usually this is done by way of self-torture of a purely physical order, and the whole training is rigidly anti-social. There need be no hate for humanity as a whole, there may be a relative tolerance, but the Yogi of this order seeks his development within the microcosm of his own being, and makes no contact with the crowd.

His purpose is self-development and he may attain it in a very high degree.

This form of Yoga is utterly beyond the powers of the contemporary European. A variation of it, known as "The Fourth Way," has found a few disciples, but its methods are handicapped on the one hand by the need for ordinary contacts with the world, and on the other by the indifference to that world, which the disciple is taught to practise. Within my experience, no follower of this "Fourth Way" has attained any such abilities as the power to separate his consciousness from his living body. On a more primitive, less effective plane, the business-man of my earlier instance may be said to practise this form of Yoga, when he sets his mind to the achievement of worldly success by denying the lure of the senses.

Self-development by wish is of an entirely different order and leads to a different goal. The soul-wish in this case is generated by love and compassion, and if it is to be kept pure these qualities must be spent on the antithetic desires arising from the lower centres not less than on humanity at large. A man cannot love God unless he first loves his neighbour, and how shall he love his neighbour if he despise himself? The means to the purification of the desires, therefore, must not in this case be by the cage and the whip. The single aim of him who practises this form of Yoga is the unification of the self. And since unification can never be attained in this or other connec-

tions by tyranny, he must win it by the realisation, education and conversion (sublimation), of the various consciousnesses arising from the lower centres. In this task the disciple has but one steady hold-fast, the power of the generative wish. If it be urgent enough it will gradually take complete control, influencing the antithetic desires until they assume the same direction as the dominant wish and are ultimately absorbed by it.

Lastly, in this connection, it should be clearly realised that the ideals of these two forms of Yoga are completely opposed. In the former case the ideal is that of the development and magnification of the self by separation. In the latter case the ideal is selflessness, and just as we desire that the lower selves should become merged in the higher, so also the ultimate aim is the mergence of that higher self into the universal.

I have not attempted so far to indicate which of these alternatives should be preferred by the followers of the way, but the final implication of the last paragraph should be sufficient. Very great

powers may be attained by those who follow the direction of will, but at the last these separated souls will be those who come to the "feast without the wedding garment" of love, and through a further immense cycle they will have to re-tread the path that leads to the Great Sacrifice.

In conclusion it must be said that the way of "wish" is more consonant with the ethical and humanitarian tendencies of the European than that of "will". The latter very seldom derives in contemporary civilisation from a purely religious desire, but rather from the wish for a far more personal gratification; and even so, its exercise is crude and uninformed. But although the second path is more acceptable to the average civilised man and woman, since it is essentially social in its practice, the winning of unity within the self by this means, involving as it does the sacrifice of wealth and of all personal ambitions save this ideal of integrity, involves a discipline no easier to follow than that of self-mastery by the exercise of the will.

J. D. BERESFORD



## THE MEANING OF "SVARA" IN INDIAN MUSIC

[It is the fashion nowadays for Indian scholars to accept docilely, in all departments of knowledge, the theories and hypotheses of Western savants. Very few Hindus aid their Occidental peers by presenting the strictly traditional view, thus enabling them not only to learn but also to help the cause of Old-World knowledge. In anthropology, for example, the Puranic view is never taken into account and Western theory is accepted as fact—man's animal ancestry, though the missing link between ape and man has not been found nor ever will be. The old Puranic view, the same as that of the still more ancient Esoteric Philosophy, held that early child-humanity was descended from lunar and solar pitris and was taught sublime arts and crafts by dynasties of kings and of teachers. This view is not even presented for consideration. The evidence in favour of such a "theory" is more formidable than all that is available to the contrary in the works of even such a celebrated and painstaking scholar as Sir James Frazer.]

Thus in this article our learned author, S. V. Viswanatha, seems to assume that Music as an art and a science was evolved by the proximity of early jungle-man to the animal kingdom. Though he refers to Music as a science originally imparted by Mahadeva and Narada, he does not test the view nor try to throw light on what this could really mean. He forthwith proceeds to show how the savage learnt the rhythm of sounds, and in doing so endows him with extraordinary capacities such as our own humanity possesses not. He makes primitive man not only highly observant but a deft logician capable of deducing a wonderful science from hearing nature sounds and of so applying it as to make it a divine art.

Not only does the Brahmanical tradition propound the view of music as a gift of the "gods"; the old Egyptian view also taught that "Isis-Osiris built cities in Egypt, stopped the overflowing of the Nile; invented agriculture and the use of the vine, music, astronomy and geometry." Again, Pythagoras taught that the world had been called forth out of Chaos by Sound or Harmony which can be heard as the music of the spheres.

Has not the time yet come for some Hindu scholars fearlessly to expound the actual views and teachings of their ancient sires? Compared with the ever-changing theories and hypotheses of the modern men of science, geologists and anthropologists, ethnologists and psychologists alike, the old doctrines will shine by their own stability and profundity.—EDS.]

"The savage brute, the untaught child and the hooded cobra—all appreciate the charm of a song."

The origin of music is lost in obscurity. It should have, in fact, arisen with the spoken word; for language as a vehicle of thought and expression of ideas is itself musical. The ideas conveyed in conversation are, of necessity, an index of one or the other of the humours that are contained in

man's physical frame, and are therefore expressive of particular moods of his thoughts and emotions. In India, these are supposed to be circumscribed in the comprehensive term *navarasa* or feeling of nine kinds, which include love, anger, pride, hostility, etc. All communications between human beings are indeed resonant of one or more of these *rasas*; thus the sounds used by man in speech while in an angry

mood are different from those uttered in a friendly conversation.

But the "grammar" of the music of the spoken word was not noticed by man, until the idea was brought home to his mind by the natural voices of birds and beasts, the rustle of the leaves of trees and the rumble of the running brook. Primitive man was always in communion with Nature—was in close contact with the innumerable objects and phenomena of nature. So he was fitted by habit and temperament to be the best exponent of the music of Nature. His senses were so developed as not to leave unfelt, unseen or unheard, any of the objects, sights or sounds that wild Nature presented to him in her gorgeously beautiful array. This is the modern view.

The Hindu idea is that music originated with the Gandharvas, a class of celestial beings, and music, therefore, was known as the Gandharva-vidyā. It was believed that the best exponents of this science and art were the goddess Sarasvatī and the divine sages Nārada and Tumburu. Music flowed down to the earth through these celestial agents. It was an accepted belief that the tunes were, some of them, masculine and others feminine in nature; that these *rāgas* and *rāginis* which were created by the Mahādeva were badly treated by the sage Nārada and, while lamenting over their fate, they were rescued and consoled by Viṣṇu. This allegorical story means that Nārada was the first to introduce changes in the

methods of singing that were current previous to his age. Nārada was an innovator in the history of Indian musical art and holds a unique place.

"The voice is prior to the instrument. This is *prima facie* so probable that it can hardly be said to need proof. It is implied in the statement of Aristoxenus that the natural laws of harmony cannot be deduced from instruments." It is clear that some of the elementary principles of the science of vocal music should have already been in existence at the period of the *Rig Veda Samhitā*. The two outstanding musical qualities required by the texts themselves in the recitation of the Vedic hymns are, first, knowledge of the *śruti* or drone which compelled the reciters to repeat their *mantras* in unison and in the same tone; and secondly, of pitch or scale which was of three kinds—high, middle, low, known by the terms *udātta*, *svarita* and *anudātta*, which must have forerun the expressions *āroha*, *sañchari* and *avaroha* of modern musical technology. Moreover, several musical instruments are mentioned in the Veda, such as *duṇḍubhi* (war drum) and *ādambāra* (drum used in [royal] proclamation); the *kāṇḍa-vīṇa* and the *vāṇa* (varieties of the lute); and the *nāḍi* and *tūṇava* (varieties of the flute).

From the manner in which the *Sāman* is sung at the present day, it is possible to say that the original hymnists of the *Sāma Veda* had knowledge of at least a few tunes (*rāgas*) made up of some of or all



the gamut of the seven *svaras*. Two *rāgas* are easily distinguishable in the *Sāman* chant, as it is practised now, viz. *Ābhogi* and *Śrīrāga* made up of the notes S. R. g. M. D., and S. R. g. M. P. D. n. respectively.\*

The musical sense of man was developed by his contact with nature. With his ears keenly trained to trace the track of wild animals, he could distinguish clearly the various sounds produced by them. The bleat of the goat, the trumpeting of the elephant, the cooing of the cuckoo, all differed widely. This was perhaps the first musical discovery that man made. He found by experience that the crow of the peacock resembled *sa* in sound; the low of the cow sounded the note *ri*; the bleat of the goat like *ga*; the sound of a waterfall resembled *ma*; the sweet note of the kokila was much like *pa*; the horse neighed like *dha* and the elephant trumpeted in rage to produce the sound *ni*.

Next came the application of this principle to his own speech by comparison with the sounds produced by the birds and beasts about him. The knowledge was not long in coming to him that he could reduce the tones of his language used in conversation to the same notes that were produced by the sounds of his companions in the forest. Thus originated the five or seven tones of the human voice (*svara*). Tradition is to the effect that at first the scale of Indian music was pentatonic only, the seven tones being a development of a later age.

The imitation of the voices of birds and beasts to which man was accustomed led him to some remarkable results. These different sounds could be produced only by the special exercise of particular organs of speech. Primitive man found by practice that the goat while bleating exercised its throat in full; the horse made full use of its tongue, while neighing, to produce a sound similar to *dha*; the kokila used the palate to produce the music of the note *pa*; the *ri* sound which the cow produced when summoning her calf touched the head; the trumpet of the elephant which caused the *ni* note affected his forehead, the peacock exercised the pharynx fully and crowed *sa*; while the sound *ma* which resembled a waterfall could be produced only if the nose also was exercised.

Next arose, perhaps, the consideration as to what faculty of the mind or the heart was most affected by the production of these various notes. It has been a recognized fact in the world of music that every *rāga* engenders a peculiar feeling in the hearer and stirs a particular emotion of his. A *rāga*, to define simply, resulted from the melodious permutation and combination of some or all of the seven notes of the musical gamut. Every *rāga* may be divided into three parts, each with its distinctive note or notes. The most important of these is the central or predominant portion called the *amśa*, while the others at the start and towards the close are known as the *graha*

and *nyāsa* respectively. The characteristic feature of a *rāga* is thus determined by its *amśa* which is the *jiva* or the soul of the *rāga*.

From the exercise of the faculties of his mind and body with reference to the voices of birds and beasts, even the savage with an ear for music could understand that the crow of the peacock evoked pity and sorrow; the low of the cow, compassion and sympathy; the bleat of the goat denoted boldness and calmness; the sound of the waterfall, sublimity and spirituality; the note of the kokila, love and joy, the neigh of the horse indicated strength and vigour; and the elephant while trumpeting looked as if pleading and debating with his master.

As the *amśa* is the predominant part of a *rāga*, the nature of the feeling or emotion provoked by it will depend mostly on this central note. Thus it may be stated in general that all the *rāgas* that have *pa* as the *amśa* note are likely to stir the erotic sense; those where the prominent note is *ma* will affect the spiritual side of man's nature; those that have *ri* as the prominent note are likely to create a feeling of affection and concord; the tunes that have *ga* as the key-note are characterised by fullness and calmness; those with

*sa* will engender a sense of sadness and sorrow; if *ni* appears as the *amśa*, pleading and entreaty are indicated; while strength and vigour characterise the *rāgas* where *dha* figures as the most prominent note.

A few *rāgas* may be cited here which illustrate the general principles outlined above. The *rāga* *Punnāgavarāli* has *sa* as the *amśa*, and it is known to cause melancholy; *Devamanohari* as well as *Śrīrāga* have *ri* as the key-note, and engender a feeling of affection and attachment; the *rāgas* *Anandabhairavi*, *Harikāmbodhi*, *Śaṅkoraḥarāṇa* and *Bhūpāla* have *ga* as the central note and are tunes of calm devotion; *Madhyamāvati* has two notes *ri* and *ma* as the *amśa*, and has therefore the mixed quality of spiritual sympathy; *Nādanāmakriya* and *Ārabhi* have *ma* as the key-note, and these raise the hearer to spiritual altitudes; *Ham-sadhvani*, *Kharaharapriya* and *Bilahari* have their *amśa* in *pa*, and are characterised by the loving appeal they make; *dha* is the chief note in the *Toḍi rāga*, and imparts to it its majesty and grandeur; *Māyāmālavagaula* as well as *Dhanyāsi* have *ni* as the predominant note and are usually sung early in the morning pleading to the Lord for His grace.

S. V. VISWANATHA

\* The Hindi gamut (*sa, ri, ga, ma, pa, dha, ni*) corresponds with the Western gamut (*do, re, mi, fa, sol, la, si*).—EDS.



## THE ORIENTALISM OF SIDNEY LANIER

[Arthur Christy here continues his study of oriental influence on American transcendentalists—Eds.]

It is reported that several decades ago, as Josiah Royce passed the home of a Cambridge matron who had invited her friends to hear a Hindu swami, he remarked jocosely to his companion: "Here do the heathen rage and the women imagine a vain thing." To-day there are few metropolitan newspapers that do not print notices of meetings of numerous Oriental cults. The transition from the supercilious contempt of Royce's contemporaries, none the less real because it was so good-naturedly described by the tolerant professor, to the widespread Oriental cultism of modern America has indeed been sudden.

As one studies the subject, he finds its roots in some of the classic pages of American literature, and its popular expression often in the mentally unemployed hordes who seek mere novelty, or the religious vagrants who fortnightly cross the threshold of a new faith. The historian of American Orientalism will be obliged to deal with both the sublime and the ridiculous.

In the realm of literature he will soon encounter the work of Sidney Lanier, unique popularizer of Oriental lore and the author of "Nirvana," a poem which is a beautiful expression of Buddhistic world-weariness and second only to Emerson's "Brahma" as an epitome of the teaching of ancient India.

Knowledge of the sources of Lanier's Orientalism is not so extensive as in Emerson's case. There is not available to scholars material which records the origin and growth of his enthusiasm. Furthermore, definite information on the Oriental books which Lanier actually read is extremely scarce. Until such a time as more definitive material is available, it will be necessary to limit one's self to the evidence of the published works.

The poem "Nirvana," written in 1869, was probably the result of the Civil War, which left Lanier desolate of health, the profession he most preferred, youthful dreams of study at Heidelberg, and the slight security of the inheritance that might have come from his family. That this is the personal element in the poem cannot be doubted; that the poem is, in the words of Lanier's latest biographer, "a veritable patchwork of ideas and phrases gathered from heaven knows where" is also true. The opening stanza suggests the temper:—

Through seas of dreams and seas of phantasies,  
Through seas of solitudes and vacancies  
And through my Self, the deepest of the seas,  
I strive to thee, Nirvana.

The second stanza clearly echoes the true Buddhistic concern with the fetters of sense and disillusionment:—

Oh long ago the billow-flow of sense  
Aroused by passion's windy vehemence,

Upbore me out of depths to heights intense,  
But not to thee, Nirvana.

The stanzas describing the varied struggles of mortal experience may be omitted, but that depicting the moment of enlightenment is worthy of note:—

The silence ground my soul keen like a spear.  
The bare thought, whetted as a sword,  
cut sheer  
Through time and life and flesh and death,  
to clear  
My way unto Nirvana.

After reaching this spiritual stage, Lanier, never able to shake off the haunting memories of the war, describes a common aspect of human life:—

I saw two lovers sitting on a star.  
He kissed her lips, she kissed his battle scar.  
They quarrelled soon, and went two ways,  
afar.

O Life! I laughed, Nirvana.

Piecemeal quotation cannot serve as a substitute for the complete poem, which cannot be reproduced for want of space. But the following pregnant stanzas demand inclusion in our sampling, for they describe the final deliverance from the bitter, fratricidal war and Lanier's ecstasy.

I slew gross bodies of old ethnic hates.  
That stirred long race-wars betwixt States  
and States.

I stood and scorned these foolish dead  
debates,

Calmly, calmly, Nirvana.

The storms of Self below me rage and die.  
On the still bosom of mine ecstasy,  
A lotus on a lake of balm, I lie  
Forever in Nirvana.

The informed reader will be quite aware that there are apparent inconsistencies in Lanier's understanding of the meaning of Nirvana. In the note which accompanied the first printing of the poem, Lanier explained that Nirvana was "the Highest

Paradise of Buddha, attainable only by long contemplation, and by perfect superiority to all passions of men and all vicissitudes of Time". The adequacy of this definition need not concern us, nor the distinction between ecstasy and non-existence. That Lanier entertained confused notions of certain similarities between Christianity and Buddhism is also probable. On the other hand, the poem was never intended to be read for its theology. As an expression of an Occidental's soul-crisis in Buddhistic terms, it is eloquent. And it should be considered a much briefer, but worthy companion piece to Edwin Arnold's "Light of Asia". There can be no doubt that it is a landmark in American Orientalism.

I do not pause to discuss other allusions to Buddha or Buddhism in Lanier's poetry. They will be found in the poems "Clover," "The Crystal," and "The Stirrup Cup". Even in *The English Novel* one finds an eclectic interpretation of the influence of a Platonic idea in the light of Buddhism. Lanier has explained that Plato wished to crush the desire for property by destroying the possibility of its exercise. He then writes:—

And what is this in its outcome but the Nirvana of the Buddhist? My passions keep me in fear and hope; therefore I will annihilate them: when I neither think nor desire, then I shall rest, then I shall enjoy Nirvana. Plato institutes a Nirvana for the ills of marriage, of offspring, of property: and he realizes it by the slow death through inanition of the desire for love, for children, for property.



Extensive disquisition is not our province here, so I pass on to the "Sketches of India".

The story of the reasons why Lanier was commissioned by the editors of *Lippincott's Magazine* to write the "Sketches of India" is not known. It is said that while he was in Philadelphia, seeing his *Florida* through the press, he read widely at the Free Library and gathered his material. Perhaps with his earlier interest in Buddhism as an incentive, and the public interest in Oriental travel-literature of the type produced by Bayard Taylor and G. W. Curtis as some assurance of an audience, he broached the scheme to the publisher and received the commission for the articles. They appeared in four numbers of *Lippincott's*, from January to April, 1876, and contained information on Indian art and religion, history and folklore, architecture and geography. Of these, our discussion will be limited to religion.

The setting of the papers is simple. Lanier is travelling in India with an acquaintance named Bhima Gandharva. He explained later that "Bhima Gandharva . . . is only another name for *Imagination*—which is certainly the only Hindu friend I have." In the first paper the friends are sight-seeing in Bombay. They discuss innumerable topics, and Gandharva tells of a recently presented play in which appeared an Englishman who, every time an Oriental happened to be in leg-reach, would give him a lusty kick and cry out, "Damn fool!" Then Gandharva

asks, "Why is the whole world like this Englishman?—upon what does it found its opinion that the Hindu is a fool? Is it upon our religion? Listen! I will recite you some matters out of our scriptures." Whereupon follows a synopsis of the *Bhagavadgita*, with paraphrase and quotation alternating.

It is obvious that Lanier's exposition of the *Gita* was a deliberate attempt to secure a sympathetic hearing for the book among uninformed Americans. Notice the selections he chose:—

He into whom all desires enter in the same manner as rivers enter the ocean, which is always full, yet does not change its bed, can obtain tranquillity. . . . Love or hate exists toward the object of each sense. One should not fall into the power of these two passions, for they are one's adversaries. . . . Know that passion is hostile to man in this world.

Bhima Gandharva concludes with this beautiful passage:—

They who know me to be the God of this universe, the God of gods and the God of worship . . . yea, they who know me to be these things, in the hour of death they know me indeed.

Completely awed after listening to a synopsis of almost the entire book, Lanier asks his friend, "When were these things written?" The answer comes: "At least nineteen hundred and seventy-five years ago, we feel sure. How much earlier we do not know."

The friends visit a Buddhist temple and emerging, seat themselves by a hillside stream. "Tell me something of Gotama Buddha," Lanier requests. "Recite some of his deliverances." His Hindu com-

panion responds in perhaps too great detail to be colloquial, but nevertheless informingly:—

I will recite to you from the "Sutta Nipata" . . . . It professes to give the conversation of Buddha, who died five hundred and forty-three years before Christ lived on earth; and these utterances are believed by scholars to have been brought together at least more than two hundred years before the Christian era.

As one reads through the commentaries of the "Sketches of India" on the religions of the Hindus, one is impressed by Lanier's constant emphasis on their antiquity. That the high moral tone of the scriptures he quotes will be accepted by his American readers, he does not doubt; that such an elevated spiritual note was uttered by men before the advent of Christ, he seems to have regarded as his business to emphasize. His work in this respect is one of the interesting phases of early American Orientalism. It is obviously propaganda.

Lanier does not ignore the perversions which have crept into the religions of India through the centuries. He gives particular attention to the subject of caste, probably because Americans were under the illusion that the Buddhist scriptures sanctioned it. After a general description of the various castes, Gandharva quotes:—

53. I call him alone a Brahman who is fearless, eminent, heroic, a great sage, a conqueror, freed from attachments—one who has bathed in the waters of wisdom, and is a Buddha.

55. What is called "name" or "tribe" in the world arises from usage only. It is adopted here and there by common consent.

57. One is not a Brahman nor a non-Brahman by birth: by his conduct alone is he a Brahman, and by his conduct alone is he a non-Brahman.

62. One is a Brahman from penance, charity, observance of the moral precepts and the subjugation of the passions. Such is the best kind of Brahmanism.

When Gandharva had concluded his recitation, only a small portion of which has been quoted, Lanier answered: "That would pass for very good republican doctrine in Jonesville." If he had lived in the era of Babbitt he might have said "Main Street".

As one reads the "Sketches of India," one receives the impression of an innocent travel account, mixed with anecdotes of foreign custom and not too bald commendation of the Hindu religions. The latter was mildly tempered, possibly by the editors, for fear that the subscribers to *Lippincott's* might be offended and cancel their subscriptions. But the impression is definite that Buddhism in its first bloom might not have been inspired by the devil. This was perhaps all the American magazine-reading public could stand in 1876. In the light of Lanier's subjective poem "Nirvana," however, the sketches offer prolific suggestions of hidden meanings and amazingly wide information, only a limited phase of which has been intimated in this paper.

ARTHUR CHRISTY



## THE FOUR OBLATIONS

[Nolini Kanta Gupta offers some interesting results of his study on a mystical verse of the *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad*. Vāch, the personification of Speech, is pictured as a goddess; our author translates it as "the Word". His interpretation of the verse deserves study; to facilitate the careful student's work we append in a footnote an extract on "Pitris"—meditation on which will throw great additional light on the verse which forms the text of the article.—EDS.]

"The Word has four breasts. The Gods feed on two, SWAHAKAR and VASHATKAR, men upon the third, HANTAKAR, and the Ancestors upon the fourth, SWADHA".—(BRIHADARANYAKA UPANISHAD. V. 8. 1.)

Ritualistically these four terms are the formulae for oblation to four Deities, Powers or Presences, whom the sacrificer wishes to please and propitiate in order to have their help and blessing and in order thereby to discharge his dharma or duty of life. *Swaha* is the offering especially dedicated to Agni, the foremost of the Gods, for he is the divine messenger who carries men's offering to the Gods and brings their blessing to men. *Vashatkar* is the offering to the Gods generally. *Hantakar* is the offering to mankind, to our kin, an especial form of it being the worship of the guests, *sarvadevamayo'tithi*. *Swadha* is the offering to the departed Fathers (*Pitris*).

The duty of life consists, it is said, in the repaying of three debts which every man contracts as soon as he takes birth upon earth—the debt to the Gods, to Men and to the Ancestors. This threefold debt or duty has, in other terms, reference to the three fields or domains wherein an embodied being lives and moves and to which he must adjust and react rightly if

he is to secure for his life an integral fulfilment. These are the family, society and the world and beyond-world. The Gods are the Powers that rule the world and beyond, they are the forms and forces of the One Spirit underlying the universe, the varied expressions of divine Truth and Reality. To worship the Gods, to do one's duty by them, means to come into contact and to be united—in being, consciousness and activity—with the universal and spiritual existence, which is the supreme end and purpose of human life. The second—a more circumscribed field—is the society to which one belongs, the particular group of humanity in which he functions as a limb. The service to society or good citizenship entails the worship of humanity, of Man as a god. Lastly, man belongs to the family, which is the unit of society; and the backbone of the family is the continuous line of ancestors, who are its presiding deity and represent the norm of a living dharma, the ethic of an ideal life.

From the psychological stand-

point, the four oblations are movements or reactions of consciousness in its urge towards the utterance and expression of Divine Truth. Like some other elements in the cosmic play, these also form a quartet—*chaturvyūha*—and work together for a common purpose in view of a perfect and all-round result.

*Swaha* is the offering and invocation. One must dedicate everything to the Divine, cast all one has or does into the Fire of Aspiration that blazes up towards the Most High, and through the tongue of that one-pointed flame call on the Divinity.

In doing so, in invoking the Truth and consecrating oneself to it, one begins to ascend to it step by step; and each step means a tearing of another veil and a further opening of the passage. This graded mounting is *vashatkara*.

*Hantakara* is the appearance, the manifestation of the Divinity—that which makes the worshipper cry in delight, "Hail!" It is the coming of the Dawn—*ahana*—when the night has been traversed and the lid rent open, the appearance of the Divine to a human vision, for the human consciousness to seize, almost in a human form.

Finally, once the Truth is reached, it is to be held fast, firmly established, embodied and fixed in its inherent nature here in life and the waking consciousness. This is *Swadha*.

The Gods feed upon *Swaha* and *Vashat*, as these represent the ascending movement of human

consciousness: it is man's self-giving and aspiration and the upward urge of his heart and soul that reach to the Gods, and it is that which the immortals take into themselves and are, as it were, nourished by, since it is something that appertains to their own nature.

And in response they descend and approach and enter into the aspiring human soul—this descent and revelation and near and concrete presence of Divinity, this *Hanta* is man's food, for by it his consciousness is nourished.

This interchange, or mutual giving, the High Covenant between the Gods and Men, to which the *Gita* too refers—

देवान्भावयतानेन ते देवा भावयन्तु वः ।

परस्परं भावयन्तः श्रेयः परमवाप्त्यथ ॥

With this sacrifice nourish the Gods, that the Gods may nourish you; thus mutually nourishing ye shall obtain the highest felicity (iii, 11)

is the very secret of the cosmic play, the basis of the spiritual evolution in the universal existence.

The Gods are the formations or particularisations of the Truth-consciousness, the multiple individualisations of the One Spirit. The *Pitris* are the Divine Fathers, that is to say, souls that once laboured and realised here below, and now have passed beyond. They dwell in another world, not too far removed from the earth, and from there, with the force of their realisation, lend a more concrete help and guidance to the destiny that is being worked out upon earth. They are forces and form-



ations of consciousness in an intermediate region between Here and There (*antahriksha*), and serve to bring men and gods nearer to each other, inasmuch as they belong to both the categories, being a divinised humanity or a humanised divinity. Each fixation of the Truth-consciousness in an earthly mould is a thing of joy to the Pitris\*; it is the *Swadha* or food

by which they live and grow, for it is the consolidation and also the resultant of their own realisation. The achievements of the sons are more easily and securely reared and grounded upon those of the forefathers, whose formative powers we have to invoke, so that we may pass on to the realisation, the firm embodiment of higher and greater destinies.

NOLINI KANTA GUPTA

\*In Esoteric philosophy the functions of the different classes of Pitris is given. Thus in her *Secret Doctrine* (II, 88), H. P. Blavatsky explains:—

The Progenitors of Man, called in India "Fathers," Pitara or Pitris, are the creators of our bodies and lower principles. They are ourselves as the first personalities, and *we are they*. Primeval man would be "the bone of their bone and the flesh of their flesh," if they had body and flesh. As stated, they were "lunar Beings."

The Endowers of man with his conscious, immortal EGO, are the "Solar Angels"—whether so regarded metaphorically or literally. The mysteries of the Conscious EGO or human Soul are great. The esoteric name of these "Solar Angels" is, literally, the "Lords" (*Nath*) of "persevering ceaseless devotion" (*pranidhāna*). Therefore they of the fifth principle (*Manas*) seem to be connected with, or to have originated the system of the Yogis who make of *pranidhāna* their fifth observance.

## MY NOTE BOOK

*The Myth of Progress—Understanding and Attainment—The Self Is or Is Not—Men on Earth and Divine Purpose—Free Will, Fact or Fiction?—Physicists and Psychologists.*

In an essay "The Myth of Progress" published in the *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, my old friend, Mr. M. D. Eder, undertakes his usual rôle of *enfant terrible*. There is no Progress; the idea is simply a myth created to make life tolerable; and the realistic objective fact is that "we are born mad, acquire morality, become stupid and unhappy, and then die". "This natural history of man under domestication," he says, "is so little agreeable to our self-love" that we devise a myth of Progress as a refuge. But if it comes to a question of devices and refuges, sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander: the "myth" of Progress for the one, and the "myth" of No Progress for the other. And even though Mr. Eder may appeal to the "objective" criterion of "natural history" it is obvious that his reading of natural history may be as subjective as that of the subjectivists themselves; and who is to decide between them? The truth appears to me that we are literally not wise enough to settle any such question at present. Save for a few rare individuals in every age, mankind, as a whole, even in its most developed members, is scarcely beginning to be able to state such questions with exactitude; and as for answering them objectively, scientifically, and, therefore, meas-

urably, neither the men nor the means as yet exist. Mankind, in short, (always excepting the few who, again, are out of court for lack of a competent jury), is trying, in the person of its intellectuals, to solve problems in algebra before it has mastered arithmetic.

\* \* \*

I agree with the editorial writer in THE ARYAN PATH for June (1934) that of the three lines of evolution perceptible to man (and hence attributed by him to Nature), the highest, because the most inclusive, is spiritual evolution defined as the Self-perception of Self. But between, first, this verbal definition and the realisation of its meaning; and, secondly, the realisation of its meaning and its actualisation in being—there may be æons of difference. From merely understanding that the highest value is self-objectivity (the ability, that is to say, to see everything thought of as self exactly as if it were not-self) it does not follow that we have it, any more than it follows that if we understand that gold is of more value than silver, we necessarily possess gold. The attainment of the state of Self-objectivity is something totally different from its understanding just as acquiring gold is something totally different from the appreciation of its value. What I am there-



fore disposed to say of the problems already referred to is that their understanding and appreciation need to be supplemented by something entirely different before they can be solved; and that, in fact, the modern mind, even when as desirous of objectivity as I know Mr. Eder's to be, is incapable of solving such problems for the simple reason that the modern mind is not, in actuality, self-objective. I beg myself as well as my readers not to mistake understanding for attainment; and not to imagine, on the strength of their realisation of certain truths, that they possess them, or, still less, that they can use them. Our being, in which alone truth is possessed, is still a long, long way behind our understanding. Is, then, Progress a "myth"? I do not know. Is it, on the other hand, a fact in Nature? Again, I do not know. Nor do I find it necessary to settle the question one way or the other for my peace of mind. To understand what the question implies, to be satisfied that one cannot answer it now, but to *hope* to be able one day to answer it, that, I think, is enough for arithmeticians not yet really capable of algebra. The attitude is not favourable to the rôle of *enfant terrible* on the positive or the negative side; but it leaves one actively contented.

\* \* \*

There is no doubt that, long before such questions can be finally settled, sides in their discussion are taken according to temperament and experience; and a species of partisanship arises, in

the course of which heads are knocked together, or, possibly, counted. There is, of course, a value in the discussion from the mere exercise of the muscles and limbs of the mind; but it is a great mistake, in my opinion, to imagine that there is any more. To repeat myself, I would say as follows:—

In the first place, things are as they are and not otherwise. This is to say that truths exist. Progress, for example, is a fact or it is not a fact; it is not a matter of opinion.

In the second place, there either is or is not a means of proving them. This is to say that discussion, in the absence of the means of proof, is merely partisanship.

In the third place, the proof, if any, cannot be confined to simple understanding; it must be part of our being.

And, finally, without this state of being, not only the proof cannot be realised, but even the question of the possibility of proof is one for faith, rather than for reason.

I am led to say this by the excursion into algebra of another of my greatly esteemed friends, Professor Denis Saurat of the French Institute, and author of a recent stimulating work: the *History of Religions*. Professor Saurat appears to me to have adopted a "side" in the controversy on the subject of the "self," *le Moi*; and to be as diligent and conscientious in the defence of his case as if he were briefed in honour to support it. He even looks for confirmatory evidence among witnesses of repute with the jury, and occasionally strains the facts to secure their support, as in the case of Valéry, for example, whom he declares, after cross-examination,

to be as destructive of "*le Moi*" as Proust, who broke the self into innumerable pieces and denied they had ever made a whole. I can certainly not myself settle the question one way or the other; but I can certainly say (without offence) that neither can my friend Professor Saurat, with all his witnesses. The existence of the self, is, I agree, a question of fact; the self is or it is not. But the distance from this logical statement to the proven conclusion that the self exists or does not exist, is all the distance from understanding to being; and, in default of being, the understanding, even at its best, is liable to change. Once again I implore myself not to be tempted to hope to arrive at truth by discussion. Only when self-objectivity is a fact of our being, and of the same unquestioned validity as any of our senses—only then can arithmetic safely pass into algebra. Only then can we know even as we are known.

\* \* \*

An attempt has been made in a recent novel entitled *Proud Man* (by Mr. "Constantine") to pass an "objective" criticism on the human species, as examined and judged by superior beings—namely, by men who have, on another planet, completed a later phase of human evolution than our own. The idea has, of course, been used before, by Utopians, like Butler; by imaginative sociologists, like Wells; and by moralists, like Mark Twain. But *Proud Man* is the first *published* attempt of which I am aware

to evaluate humanity on Earth from the stand-point of his divine purpose, as a creature in process of becoming that which he is designed to be. It must be admitted that the attempt, in the hands of anybody not already developed past our present stage, is somewhat temerarious (mere premature algebra, in short); and, from certain unmistakable signs, it is clear that the author is still human, all too human. On the other hand, I confess that I found the book stimulating, since it provoked in me precisely that kind of effort which it is the chief aim of Culture to arouse—the effort to see myself *as I see others*. As the narrative proceeds—being chiefly the report of an "angel" of his observations of Man on Earth—the reader is gradually made aware that *he himself* is one of them. I do not know by what trick of fence the author manages to turn the mirror round and to make the reader see himself in it; but the trick is accomplished; and from a somewhat self-satisfied superiority over the defects of our humanity as portrayed, the reader is made to pass through the stages of apprehension that he may be one of the creatures described, growing belief that he probably is, to, finally, the shocking certainty of it. The experience is salutary, but not, I fear, lasting; for, here again, the difference is abysmal between realisation and *being*. It is possible that if one could continue to look at one's self as if one were somebody else, the cumulative effect would be transforming; but an occasional



glimpse, however poignant, is sooner or later forgotten.

\* \* \*

"The Principle of Uncertainty," that affirms that it is impossible to increase the accuracy of measurement of velocity without introducing uncertainty into determination of position, is a weak straw for the doctrine of Free Will to cling to, though a considerable number of people have clutched at it. In the first place, the indeterminable (by any means) is not necessarily the indeterminable; and, in the second place, the mode of proof of Free Will or otherwise is not and never will be a matter of measurement. The range and quality of any one of our senses can be measured, but vision itself, hearing itself, taste itself, is subject to no possible proof but direct experience, or what I have called *fact*. Now it may be the case that Free Will is not a fact in the same sense. It may be that we are like a blind race talking of "vision" without the least experience of what it means. Again, it may be that from time to time—like a blind man who occasionally sees—we experience the possession of a unique sense which we call Free Will. But, in the absence of its normal possession by ourselves, and in the absence of its normal possession by others than ourselves, it is impossible, I think, to do more than either to "discuss" it, or to speak of it without "proof". Those who see can "prove" what they see to those who can see; but they can prove nothing of sight to the blind. And similarly (at least presumably) those with "free will"

can prove their possession of it to those who have it. As for the rest even evidence is not evidence.

\* \* \*

It is a pity that modern physicists are not also psychologists, or modern psychologists also physicists, since the conceptions now current among physicists would be very useful to psychologists. The difficulty of modern physics, as everybody knows, lies in the unimaginability of its conceptions; they cannot be pictured, but exist only as operations in process. Even Einstein or Jeans is incapable of imagining curved space, let us say; but any competent modern physicist can not only take the curvature of space as proved, but act as if it were so, with complete confidence that the facts will bear him out. Now if the Universe, in respect of Space and Time, has become for the physicist a construct of his mind that is non-picturable, but at the same time is valid for practical no less than theoretical purposes—what is to prevent the psychologist from taking the "psyche" as proved, and proceeding to treat it *as if* it were the reality of the actual physical body? The universe for the physicist is something entirely different from the Universe for the "sensualist"; the latter makes pictures where the former realises processes. At the same time, though both universes are valid in their own terms, there cannot be the smallest doubt that the former conditions the latter; and that, in this sense, the physicists are nearer the source of reality than

the "sensualists". In the same way, the psychologist who deals with "psyche" is nearer the source of reality than the physiologist who deals with pictures. It is true that he is concerned with processes; it is also true that they are non-picturable; but, exactly as the physicist is capable of more accurate measurements of the Universe than the "sensualist," it is my conviction that a psychology that considered "psyche" alone would arrive at greater truth than

our physio-psychologists to-day who insist upon pictures. It is unfortunately the case, however, that, in Europe at any rate, no Einstein among psychologists has yet arisen. The physical Universe has been resolved into a system of operations unimaginable and non-picturable; our sensible Universe is only a shadow cast by it. Physicists have become psychologists on the grand scale, while psychologists have remained physicists on the small scale.

A. R. ORAGE

## CLASH OF CULTURES

One of the most significant addresses at the International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, which recently met in London was that by Prof. Arnold J. Toynbee on "Psychological Problems which Arise from the Contact of Cultures". Prof. Toynbee, as quoted in *The Manchester Guardian* for August 2nd, brought out the havoc wrought in the Near East by the wholesale adoption of Western political institutions foreign to the geographical and historical background and the social heritage of the people. He remarked that "the destructiveness of such a process might be thought to be providing its own safeguard," and pertinently demanded:—

Why is it, then, that the non-Western peoples in recent times, when once they have embarked upon the course of adopting our Western political institutions, have tended to go on to the bitter end, notwithstanding the terrible sufferings and loss which this course has imposed upon them?

It is not foreign political institutions alone or chiefly which the Near-Eastern

nations and the Far-Eastern as well have shown a disposition to adopt blindly. The East in general, some countries more than others of course, is suffering from ill-assimilated alien culture, adopted uncritically without adaptation to indigenous customs or the native culture pattern. The result in many cases is as fantastic as would be a silk hat and formal dinner coat worn with a *dhoti* and sandals. The Occidentalized Easterner is a man without a background, a misfit everywhere.

The consequences are far-reaching. The overvaluing of foreign manners and customs, attitudes and viewpoints, in itself is far less serious than the attendant disprizing of ancestral culture. THE ARYAN PATH is constantly stressing the fact that when Indians, for example, leave untapped the philosophical and spiritual resources of their mighty heritage to seek abroad their mental sustenance, the whole world is the poorer.

PH. D.



## NEW BOOKS AND OLD

## THE SAGE OF CHELSEA

[At this hour it is not only appropriate but necessary to describe Dr. L. P. Jacks as a great Christian. A broad-minded Unitarian, he has served the cause of humanism and, as author and well-known Editor of *The Hibbert Journal* for over thirty years, he has contributed substantially towards liberalizing religious thought in Christian countries.—EDS.]

Mr. Froude's biography of Carlyle, published soon after his death in four large volumes, evoked, as is well known, a storm of indignation from his family and many of his personal friends, the echoes of which have by no means wholly subsided. The work was denounced as belittling, and even dishonouring, to one of the greatest men of his age; in particular, for having misrepresented him at a point where even an angel-biographer must tread with caution, that, namely, of his relations with his wife—"unhappy" according to Froude, "happy" according to his opponents, though Carlyle himself would not have accepted either adjective as a final valuation of a marriage or of anything else. The effect of the controversy was to produce, at intervals, a multitude of biographies, studies, and monographs, many of them consciously designed to counter Froude's misrepresentation at this point as well as at others. Of biographies subsequent to Froude's the most interesting and fully documented is Mr. David Alec Wilson's work in six volumes, of which the sixth, owing to Mr.

Wilson's death in 1933, has now been most faithfully and competently completed by his nephew Mr. D. Wilson MacArthur.

The present writer, who never knew or even saw Carlyle, but has been a diligent reader of him from youth upwards, and never so full of admiration for his genius as now, has to confess that he finds himself unable to share fully in the indignation provoked by Froude's biography. He is aware of its many inaccuracies and deplores them; he is persuaded that Froude did not catch the secret (who has?) of Carlyle's relations with his wife, but, all the same, Froude's portrait remains (for the present writer), the figure, in all essentials, of the great man whom Carlyle's writings declare him to have been, and none the less great, but perhaps rather the greater, for the faults of his character, faults unquestionably over-emphasized by Froude at certain points, but hardly to be treated as non-existent.

Mr. Wilson's work enables us to correct these errors, with good evidence to support the correction, though with occasional

traces of an animus against Froude, which it might have been better to avoid. It is a lovable man whose doings and sayings are here recorded, and never more lovable than in old age. And yet, after reading all Mr. Wilson has collected and written, one cannot but feel that the Carlyle he presents and the Carlyle presented by Froude are, in essentials, the same Carlyle. The two biographical portraits differ in much the same way as the canvas portraits painted by various artists during his lifetime, some representing him as a man of harsh, forbidding and aggressive countenance, others (notably that of Mrs. Allingham in the Scottish National Portrait Gallery) as serene, gentle, lovable and wholly at peace. It is perhaps a tribute to the greatness of Carlyle that he needs *both* types of biography, *both* types of portrait, to represent him as he really was. One has only to look steadily at either type to realize how readily it might pass into the other, reminding us of "the wrath of the Lamb". The key to his relations with his wife may possibly lie in that. And of hers with him. For hers, too, was a nature large enough for an immense distance between its best and its worst. Such natures are not easily belittled by the exhibition of their faults nor easily exalted by the praise of their excellence. In themselves they are greater than both. Neither

Carlyle nor his wife were saints after the conventional model. But both were souls tried in the fire and heroic in differing ways.

Unless he were otherwise informed of it, the reader would hardly suspect that the sixth volume of this monumental record was not the work of the hand which had produced the preceding five. In the arrangement, the method, the restraint and the carefulness there is no break of continuity, and the *obiter dicta*, always interesting, might have come from the same source in the last volume as in the others. Mr. Wilson knew what he was about when he entrusted his nephew with the continuation of his work. In its unbroken totality it is the fullest in authentic detail of all the Carlyle biographies yet written, resembling in some respects the work of those Dutch artists in which every hair in the sitter's beard is separately represented, not perhaps the greatest portraits when judged as works of art, but full of information for the student of character who can read the significance of little things as well as of great. Should the day ever come, and it seems not unlikely, when the name of Carlyle will gather to itself a fame and a splendour, greater even than it now has, or has had, in the past, Mr. Wilson's immense and pious labours so admirably completed by his nephew will not go unrecognized by the gratitude of posterity.

L. P. JACKS



## DAYANANDA SARASWATI\*

[Franklin Edgerton, Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology at Yale University, examines the Vedic interpretation of the great founder of the Arya Samaj—Eds.].

"It is well known fact that 5000 years ago, in the whole world there existed no other religion but the Vedic. All its teachings are unopposed to the dictum of knowledge . . . The Pauranic [i. e. popular Hindu], the Jain (or the Buddhistic), the Christian and the Mohammadan [religions] are all opposed to the Vedic religion, and are the root of all other religions that are extant in the world" (p. 307). "Since the beginning of the world till 5000 years back, the Aryas [people of India] were the sovereign rulers of the whole earth" (p. 309). "All the knowledge that is extant in the world originated is Aryavarta (India). Thence it spread to Egypt, thence to Greece, thence to the Continent of Europe, thence to America and other countries" (p. 312). "Take for example the case of Egypt, Greece, or the Continent of Europe. The people of all these countries were without a trace of learning before the spread of knowledge from India" (p. 222). "Sanskrit . . . is the mother of all other languages"; that is why God revealed the Veda in Sanskrit rather than in the language of "some particular country," which would have shown partiality to that country (p. 221). What is the proof of the divine origin of the Vedas? "The book in which God is described as He is . . . and in which nothing is said that is opposed to the laws of nature, reason, the evidence of direct cognisance, etc., the teachings of the highly learned and altruistic teachers of humanity, and the intuitions of pure souls, and in which the laws, nature and properties of matter and the soul are propounded in just accordance with what they really are, is the book of Divine revelation.

Now the Vedas alone fulfil all the above conditions" (p. 221). Do the Vedas sanction animal sacrifices? Only in passages which have been maliciously interpolated by wicked heretics (p. 321). If a plurality of gods seems to be mentioned in the Veda, this refers only to *devatās*, that is, natural powers; thus the Vedic god Indra is "the all-pervading electricity" (p. 191); "it is nowhere said that it [a *devatā*] is God or is the object of our adoration" (p. 190).

These are literal quotations (but for the correction of misspellings for which the original author cannot be blamed), or fair summaries, of statements made by Swami Dayananda Saraswati, according to this official translation. Dayanand was the founder of the Arya Samaj, which includes in its membership many intelligent and enlightened people, and which has done a great deal of work which this reviewer admires and respects. To what extent the Samaj now accepts the religious and intellectual views of its founder, I cannot say. But it is difficult to see how the publication in English form of this book of his, containing such statements as the above, can do anything but harm to the organization. I have no desire to ridicule the Arya Samaj, nor the good Dayanand himself. I have not the slightest doubt that he was a sincere, earnest and morally worthy person. He was also not without learning; but his learning was limited to what could be read in Indian languages in the third quarter of the nineteenth century. He was inspired by a very natural and, in my opinion, just resentment against the attacks made on his native religion

and culture by foreigners, especially Christian missionaries. He held, rightly as I think, that many of these attacks were due to mere ignorance and prejudice. Unfortunately I cannot feel that the way to combat ignorance and prejudice on one side is by equal ignorance and prejudice on the other. The way to convince intelligent people, in or out of India, that the Christian missionaries are wrong, is not to state as "well known facts" such grotesque absurdities as that five thousand years ago there existed no other religion than the Vedic, that all the world's learning originated in India, that Sanskrit is the mother of all languages, etc. That the Vedic poets meant "electricity" by the god Indra, or even that they knew anything about electricity as scientists of to-day understand that term, could be believed only by the aid of the blindest faith. Whatever the nature of the Vedic *devatās*, they are "objects of adoration" in almost every Vedic hymn. If references to animal sacrifices in the Veda are "interpolations," a very large part of the Vedic texts must be interpolations. The sad truth, which this book makes only too clear, is that Swami Dayanand strikingly resembled his missionary adversaries in mentality and degree of information.

A large part of the book is devoted to polemics against other religions,—not only foreign cults, but also all Indian philosophical and religious sects known to Dayanand, except strict Vedism as interpreted by him. The admirable tolerance which has, on the whole, characterized Indian religious thought was certainly not one of Dayanand's virtues. One wishes that he might have known and pondered Asoka's great Edict on Toleration, which says that one who thinks to glorify his own sect by vilifying the religious beliefs of others, in reality does serious injury to his own sect. To be sure, no Christian or Mohammedan can afford to throw stones at him on this score; their own houses have too much glass.

Though his main slogan is "back to the Vedas," the author was in some re-

spects an innovator; whether consciously or unconsciously one is not always sure. He modifies or rejects some of the traditional orthodox beliefs of the Vedic religion. So, for instance, he refuses to accept the Brāhmaṇas and Upanishads as truly "Vedic"; he admits only the hymns (*Samhitās*) as canonical. Even they, at least as commonly interpreted, whether by Hindu pandits or western scholars, contain of course much that goes counter to his views. But here Dayanand can always fall back on one of the two escapes noted above. Either the disturbing passages are "interpolations," deliberately foisted upon the Vedas by evil and designing heretics; or else such passages are to be interpreted in some figurative way. Pious adherents of other religions have also made use of these two methods; especially the latter is very familiar in historic Christianity.

Besides the dogmatic parts, the book contains more or less full instructions for the conduct of ordinary life. Such subjects as the education of children, marriage, dietary regulations, and even the duties of rulers and persons in authority, are set forth in considerable detail. Broadly speaking Dayanand follows the traditions of orthodox Hinduism in such matters. But occasionally he modifies them, justifying himself by the assertion that the Vedas contain no such prescriptions as orthodoxy lays down. In addition to the Vedic texts, his most respected authority is Manu, the only "law-book" which he is willing to accept. Even this, of course, is not "inspired".

From the book as a whole one gets the impression of a very vivid, colourful, and forceful personality, such as is appropriate to the founder of a new religious organization. That organization may with perfect propriety continue to derive inspiration from his rugged strength, honesty, and patriotism. It is not necessary to accept his opinions on matters of scientific fact. But since these opinions are now presented publicly, and officially, to the whole

\* *The Light of Truth*. By Swami Dayananda Saraswati. Trans. by Dr. Chiranjiva Bharadwaja. (The Arya Samaj, Madras. Re. 1-8).



world in English dress, might it not be well for the leaders of the Arya Samaj to make it clear at the same time, (if such is the case, as I suppose it is) that while they are pursuing the broad

aims laid down by the founder, they do not necessarily defend his scholarly or scientific views, nor even, perhaps, his dialectic methods?

FRANKLIN EDGERTON

*The Art of Life.* By WILLIAM KINGSLAND, M. I. E. E. (The C. W. Daniel Co., London. 3s. 6d.)

Mr. Kingsland believes that humanity is *en route* for godhead. This book makes that very clear. It is, in facts, its central theme. But, as Mr. Kingsland also believes that the race will be millions of years on the road, it will be seen that his is no easy optimism. On the contrary, his book is not a signpost indicating the primrose path. It is a challenge, for it asserts that only by discipline, devotion and dedication can the race attain the full stature of its potentiality.

This is essentially a practical book. Its first part is concerned wholly with the body but, unlike many modern writers on health, Mr. Kingsland does not regard "fitness" as an end in itself. For him, the body is an instrument. In somewhat the same way, in Part II, he is more interested in the supraconscious than the subconscious mind. And that is very refreshing. After all, the basement isn't the whole of the house. Mr. Kingsland invites us to look at the view from the turret. Also, in Part III, he begs us to disassociate the word, spirit, from the parish-pump dogmas of antagonistic creeds. He asks us to regard the spiritual as the reality of our daily lives, and not merely as a vague something which may become operative in "eternity".

Also, he tells us that in all ages there have been those—Initiates, Adepts, Masters, Mahatmas—who have entered into their spiritual birthright. And that, by so doing, they have

"forestalled the race". That is, by developing their spiritual faculties and powers, they have achieved, as individuals, that which will take millions of years for the race, as a whole, to attain. These men and women were prophecies. We remain ego-centric: they became cosmo-centric.

This book, therefore, is concerned with the *whole nature* of man. It indicates a synthesis of man's potentialities—physical, mental, and spiritual. It asserts that, essentially, the religions of the world are one; and—by a number of quotations from Eastern and Western mystics—it reveals the spiritual kinship between the utterances of those for whom religion is not a rite but a reality.

Above all, there is recognition of the fact that "the Bible was written by mystics for mystics, and has been interpreted by materialists for materialists". To Mr. Kingsland, the "second coming" and the "crucifixion" are inner continual processes. "Salvation" is a living ordeal—not a pat on the back, in the next world, for those who swallow dogmas in this one. The religious life is the development of our "spiritual nature and powers *here and now*". It is that, or it is nothing. It is to enter the interior world of principalities and powers—and to gain dominion. It is not a series of set observances. It is not a kind of celestial sweepstake. It is not an opium dream for those who are afraid of life, or those who are afraid of death.

It is a Deed—made flesh.

CLAUDE HOUGHTON

*Buddha's Teachings, being the Sutta-Nipāta*, edited with an English Version by LORD CHALMERS, Volume 37, Harvard Oriental Series, (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., U. S. A., Humphrey Milford, London).

The appearance of a new volume in the Harvard Oriental Series is an event in the world of Oriental Scholarship. This noble Series of texts and translations, founded by Henry Clarke Warren and Charles Rockwell Lanman in 1891, and continued by the latter since Warren's death in 1899, now embraces 40 volumes, 31 of which are actually issued and most of the others are nearly ready or in an advanced state of preparation.\*

In the volume under review Lord Chalmers, a distinguished Pāli scholar and sometime Governor of Ceylon,† gives a metrical rendering of the *Sutta-Nipāta* which contains some of the most ancient parts of the Buddhist Scriptures in the Pāli tradition. The original text and the English rendering are printed facing each other, and it is instructive to see how, without sacrificing the essential tone and sentiment of the original, Lord Chalmers has contrived to present here in chaste and polished English verse some of the most remarkable utterances of the great World-Teacher. It is verily a monument to the translator's art. We have read the Pāli by itself and the English by itself and enjoyed doing both without being tempted, for a clearer understanding of the sense, to turn from the English to the Pāli. Indeed, in several passages, by reason of eschewing the redundant and condensing the rest, the effect produced by Lord Chalmers's English version was found by us to be much more agreeable and enrapturing, reminding us every now and then of Edwin Arnold's poetic masterpiece, "The Light of

Asia". Lord Chalmers is a Pāli scholar of no mean pretensions, possessing as he does thirty years of high-class scholarly activity to his credit.

The work is singularly free from any woodenness or pedantry. Take for example a common Pāli word like *Samkhāra* (Sk. *Samskāra*). It is often rendered by "latent or subliminal impressions," a rendering which emphasises one aspect of the original word, but does not bring out the part which the "latent impressions" play in the building of newer things or forms. "Confection" is a horrid, shall we say, *trans-vocabulation* for the word affected by some scholars. Lord Chalmers's "plastic-forms" is just right. It is a genuine English expression that everybody can understand, and it brings out quite adequately all the implications of the original word. There are many passages in the translation that can be looked upon as distinctive contributions to English literature. We feel we must confess that although we have studied considerable portions of the *Sutta-Nipāta* in the original, we never felt tempted to read the text through at a sitting. But Lord Chalmers's translation, into which we at first intended to dip here and there merely with a view to quiet the reviewer's conscience, we could not, and did not, lay aside until we had gone to the end. We are accordingly convinced that volumes like the one before us are bound to go a long way in fulfilling the noble aim of the Harvard Oriental Series in promoting mutual understanding and mutual good will amongst the Nations of the East and the West.

A short Introduction discussing the place of the *Sutta-Nipāta* in the Buddhist Canon and a serviceable Index add largely to the usefulness of the volume.

S. K. BELVALKAR

\* As the writer of this review has been responsible for one or two lacunae in the Series, it gives him great pleasure to announce—now that he is freed from service—that Vol. 22 will be issued in 1935, while the press-copy of Vol. 23, *Deo volente*, he hopes to be able to place at the feet of his *Guru* in 1936, or even earlier.

† One would wish that such a combination of the scholar and the statesman—of the king and the philosopher—were more frequent!



*The Garden of the Prophet.* By Kahlil Gibran. (Alfred A. Knopf, New York. \$ 2.50.)

Kahlil Gibran, who died in 1931 at the age of 28, was born in Mt. Lebanon, and is regarded by the Arabic speaking peoples as the genius of his time. His poetry has been translated into more than twenty different languages. Auguste Rodin, whose sculpture inspired Mr. Bernard Shaw's new play, "Six of Calais," compared Gibran's drawings and paintings with the work of William Blake. Gibran's latest works, including *The Garden of the Prophet*, were written in English, in which his style has been described as "majestic and beautiful," and "cadenced and vibrant with feeling, bringing to one's ears the majestic rhythm of Ecclesiastes". In *The Garden of the Prophet*, the master, Almustafa, returns from his seafaring, teaches his disciples and answers their questions, and finally departs from his garden again. "Life," the prophet tells his followers, "is older than all things living, even as beauty was winged ere the beautiful was born on earth, and even as truth was truth before it was uttered." Indeed, the ecstatic awareness of the essential unity of all that exists is the leading motive of the entire prose-poem, and the experience is altered again and again, each time with the freshness of a new Spring. "Death changes nothing," Almustafa says, "but the masks that cover our faces."

Yet, for whatever reason, it is the very insistence of Gibran's heart and mind on this unquestionable truth that breaks the spell cast upon the reader both by the meaning of the poem, and by the simple, often cantative, but never monotonous language. The inquisitive disciple, Mannus, who "saw plants in flower cleaving to sycamore trees," asked "what of the parasites?" The prophet's answer is a fundamental truth: "All there is lives on all there is, and all there is lives in the faith, shoreless, upon the bounty of the Most High." Does that, however, prove, "My friend we are all parasites" to be equally true? We have to answer

that it does not, for the reason that while the first statement is true, the second is useless for deciding upon the best conduct of life.

Asked why he never spoke of ugliness, Almustafa answers, "Call nothing ugly, my friend, save the fear of a soul in the presence of its own memories." It is impossible, in the presence of so many observations of this tenor, to avoid the sensation of being in the presence of a spirit teaching how to solve the problems of this world while too remote from them to know them. Rodin notwithstanding, the seven mystical drawings by the author which illustrate *The Garden of the Prophet* confirm this impression. In meditating upon the unity of all things Gibran appears to be at peace with himself, yet it is not the peace of life. Blake was at war with himself because he was as determined to live in this world as in the Heaven within.

This is not to say that *The Garden of the Prophet* is of no value to the human spirit of to-day. On the contrary, it has a high value arising almost from its defects as a work of prophecy or poetry. In the world of speed and sensation in which most people now live, many of them fear that inner life is rapidly perishing while man becomes a puppet operated by reaction to his environment. For such a disease Gibran's poem is more than an anodyne. It is a tonic adventure in meditation, and a means of true repose. For, while the mind is not stilled, there is much beauty to experience, and occasionally a noble appreciation of the treasure that is consciousness, and that alone makes the awareness of either beauty or truth possible. "Being," the prophet says, "is to be a weaver with seeing fingers, a builder mindful of light and space, to be a ploughman and feel that you are hiding a treasure with every seed you sow" . . . Six days, Emerson said, for action; is one too many for meditation? I am grateful for the meditation vouchsafed to me in *The Garden of the Prophet*.

A. NEWSOME

*A New Argument for God and Survival, and a Solution to the Problem of Supernatural Events.* By MALCOLM GRANT. (Faber and Faber, Ltd., London. 12s. 6d.)

As his title suggests, Mr. Malcolm Grant claims to have discovered a new and conclusive proof of theism. His line of argument may be roughly summarised as follows: extraordinary events, including psychic, occult, and spiritualistic phenomena, are undoubtedly real and of frequent occurrence. Such events have been carefully and systematically investigated during the last fifty years and more by a number of highly qualified men of science and others, who have established the facts, but have failed to find any hypotheses which satisfactorily explain them. Every theory that has been advanced comes up against whole categories of happenings which contravene it. Now, if the phenomena were in accordance with natural laws, these laws would necessarily by this time have been discovered and formulated. The fact that this is not the case proves—so Mr. Grant contends—that the phenomena are not governed by law at all, but are caused by the free volition of an all-powerful personal God, are in fact miracles. Incidentally Mr. Grant dismisses with a gesture of contempt the explanations, based on immemorial occult tradition, which were re-introduced to the Western world by H. P. Blavatsky.

Having thus defined his premises, Mr. Grant proceeds with a show of logic of the scholastic order to erect on them a structure of theological theory, much of which, we imagine, will shock his more orthodox theistic brethren. God is the cause of all miracles good and bad alike of every religion and cult; and is the fountain of all revelations, whether true or false. He has his own high purposes

to serve by them; and in furthering his ends, Mr. Grant writes:—

Clearly God will not hesitate to use the harshest, basest, and most unscrupulous means (as we count baseness, etc.) to further certain of his aims. To put it briefly, God not only can, but does, act the part of Satan. . . .

It seems to me impossible that any criticism which takes the right view of revelations can come to any other conclusion than that Jesus was a human being, chosen, inspired, guided, exploited, and in part deceived, by God, as have been many other religious leaders before and since.

If Mr. Grant had really succeeded in establishing the existence and attributes of a personal God on these lines, one would be justified in thinking that such a deity would be better *disestablished*; but the whole of his elaborate and ingenious theorising fails because it is based on the fallacious assumption that, because occult phenomena have not been satisfactorily explained by psychical researchers, they are therefore miracles. Inasmuch as these psychical researchers, able and industrious as many of them undoubtedly are, are unable to explore the phenomena on the plane of their causation, or to produce them at will for purposes of experiment, but can only contact such sporadic and irregular effects as are manifested in the physical world, their inability to explain is easy to understand. How could the natural history of fishes have been formulated by observers limited to watching the occasional signs of subaqueous life that show themselves on the surface of sea or river—the blowing of a whale, the swift flash through the air of a flying fish, or a trout leaping at a may-fly? You might measure, count, and classify such occurrences indefinitely, and even take precautions to make sure they were not being fraudulently produced by human agency; but your eventual contribution to ichthyology would be of very little value.

R. A. V. M.



*The Origin and Development of Religion in Vedic Literature.* By P. S. DESHMUKH, M. A., D. Phil., with Foreword by A. Berriedale Keith. (Oxford University Press. 22s. 6d.)

This book is an excellent example of the type of scholarship that dominates our centres of academic learning. Accurate, careful, well documented, exhibiting first-hand acquaintanceship, not only with the original texts, but with all the mass of "recognised" scholarship in the principal European languages, the book plays the scholarly game according to all the rules laid down by the best "authorities". To those who like that sort of thing it may be confidently recommended. The Vedic Gods are lucidly classified and "explained," the Vedic religion is linked up with the earlier Indo-Iranian religion, and that with the still earlier (somewhat conjectural) Indo-European religion. Perhaps the most original contribution is the author's contention that the Indo-European religion was "religious" from the very beginning and was not, as has often been maintained, a development out of more primitive "magical" beliefs, arising out of the breakdown of the latter in experience. The author brings a good deal of evidence to support his contention, and holds that the Vedic religion was from the outset a "poetic" worship of deified natural forces vaguely anthropomorphised and almost entirely beneficent. All this is very capably done, though it is perhaps a little irritating to be told that "Keith has established" or "Macdonnell has demonstrated" this or that point, without being given any chance to check the "demonstration". They may be the author's gurus but they aren't necessarily everybody's.

Apart, however, from the scholarly game with its fixed but unproved axioms such as that all religion originated out of primitive notions, whether "poetic" or otherwise, that all philosophical conceptions are certainly "late," that magic and religion had no other basis than childish faulty

reasoning, and its apparent belief that in the ancient world men went about like the character in Dickens saying "here's a hill, let's worship it!"—apart from all this, the book has little interest. Anyone who had hoped that an Indian scholar, at least, would be able to give us some real insight into the Vedic literature will be sadly disappointed, though he will find some interesting facts here and there if he is prepared to supply the necessary insight himself. The author's utter lack of perception of the real inner meanings of the Vedic hymns is clearly "established" (as he might say) by his confessed failure to understand why the Gāyatri mantra should have been selected for such especial veneration and be considered to contain the essence of all the Vedas. Ability to account for the unique importance of Gāyatri may be regarded as a critical test of an expositor's power to penetrate beyond the letter of the Vedic texts and to reveal something of their inner meaning. From this point of view this book fails lamentably. One other instance will suffice. We read a great deal about the worship of sky-gods such as Dyaus, and are invited to admire the picture of early Aryans contemplating the beneficent light of the sky in rapt (if slightly stupid) adoration. It doesn't appear even to occur to the author that the reason the Aryan Rishis worshipped the "sky-god" was not because they were wonder-struck by the beneficent daylight but because the expanse of luminous blue was to them a symbol of an even more beneficent Light, a Light "which never was on sea or land," a Light which the few, the Rishis, have seen in all ages but to represent which to the unseeing many they have always been forced to employ more or less material symbols. No doubt it is true that Keith has not demonstrated nor Macdonnell established this Light, nor has it been explained *Brahmasutrapadaishchaiva hetumadbhirvinischitaih*, "in decisive Brahmasutra words, full of reasonings," by Griswold, Oldenberg or Kaegi; nevertheless, as

Galileo might have said, "It shines for all that"! Perhaps too, Sri Krishna (or the author of the *Gita* if preferred) knew more about the real meaning of the Veda than our modern teachers and was not merely trying to support a new creed by appealing to ancient authority when he said: "*Vedaischa sarvair aham eva vedya*"—"I am that which is to be known in all the Vedas."

Readers must judge for themselves.

*Kinkinīmālā.* By Y. MAHALINGA SASTRI M.A., B.L., Advocate (Madras Rs. 2-0-0.)

Sanskrit is said to be a dead language. If a dead language means a language that is no longer used as a mother-tongue, then Sanskrit is certainly dead. For, nowhere is it used as a mother-tongue proper. But Sanskritists resent the epithet "dead" being applied to their language. And there are some very cogent reasons for it. Sanskrit is still the medium of expression for Pandits of the old school in the different parts of the country. It is still being used as a conveyance of thought by Sanskritists of both the old and the new school in the many publications that are issued year after year. Commentaries on different works, dissertations on various Darśanic topics and especially on Vedānta, poems and even dramas, are being published in Sanskrit. But above all, the literature in this "language of the gods," (the Vedas and the Upaniṣads, the Mahābhārata, the Bhagavadgītā, the Rāmāyana and the Puranas, and the vast mass falling under the convenient term classical), is even in this century as much a source of inspiration to a large majority of Hindus in their secular and religious life as it was in ancient times. To the Hindus, therefore, Sanskrit has never been and will never be a lifeless tongue.

The publication under review is a

It is useless to criticise the learned author of the book for not building a temple when all he intended to give us was a museum. It is quite a good museum. I have tried to indicate to which class of visitors it will be interesting and to which class it will not.

SRI KRISHNA PREM

[The reviewer is an Englishman and a Cambridge graduate who has retired to a life of study and meditation in the Himalayas. —Eds.]

welcome indication of the life that pulsates in this "dead" language. It is a collection of short poems in Sanskrit by a man, who, in addition to holding University degrees, possesses hereditary Sanskrit learning in him. For, he is a descendant of the great Appaya Dikṣita, whose eminence in more than one department of Sanskrit learning is so well known.

The poems in this book deal with varied subjects. They fall under ten different groups such as salutations to various gods; poems dealing with love; descriptions of nature; and addresses to a cuckoo, an owl etc. In some of these the author's close observation of nature is evident. Some of the poems are translations of well-known passages in English and these have been very well done indeed.

Mr. Māhalinga Śāstri wields great command over the language and writes in an easy flowing style. Some of the poems can be set to music with the proper *Rāga* and *Tāla*, which have been duly pointed out in an Appendix. Yatibhaṅgas are met with in a few places such as 2a on p. 57, 4a on p. 68, 4b on p. 73 and 5a on p. 100. Those could perhaps have been avoided.

The book is altogether a creditable performance and we eagerly await the publication of the other volumes in the Series and of the other works of the author mentioned in Appendix D.

A. B. GAJENDRAGADKAR



*The Story of Kalaka: Texts, History, Legends and Miniature Paintings of the Svetambara Jain Hagiographical work, The Kalakācāryakathā (with 15 plates).* By W. NORMAN BROWN (Smithsonian Institution, Washington D. C., Freer Gallery of Art, Oriental Studies, No. 1).

We have great pleasure in welcoming the story of Kalaka. The casual purchase of a MS. by Prof. W. Norman Brown at Benares has resulted in this beautiful edition—Oriental Studies, No. 1—which we hope is the first of an important series of publications.

We give below the story of Kalakacarya in short:

There was a king named Vajrasimha in the city of Dhāravāsa. His queen was Surasundari. She had a son Kalaka and a daughter Saraswati. One day the prince Kalaka, while returning from horse-riding met Guṇākara Acarya with his retinue of noble monks. The Acharya was preaching the religion of the Jinas—the noble doctrine of *Ahimsa*. The prince attracted by the noble truth offered himself as a disciple, and got initiated as a monk after obtaining permission from his parents. The prince succeeded his master, Guṇākara as the chief of the Sanga. Kalaka, as Acharya over 500 monks, arrived at Ujjaini and stayed in a park. People from the city went in large numbers to offer worship and to listen to the Acharya's preaching. Kalaka's sister, Saraswati, who had become a nun, was also one of the female disciples of Suri Kalaka. King Gardabhilla of Ujjaini happened to see the nun Saraswati and was attracted by her beauty. Being a wicked king, Gardabhilla had her abducted and cast her into his seraglio against her will. Her cries for help were of no avail. When the master Kalaka advised the king to release the nun and not to besmirch the royal family, the king would not yield. Then the Acharya took a vow that he would uproot this king, violator of Dharma.

The learned Suri leaving the city went beyond the Indus to the land of

Sākakula. There the nobles were called the Sahis and the overlord Sāhanu-Sāhi. There Suri Kalaka stayed with a certain Sahi who became his good friend. One day a messenger from the overlord appeared before the Sahi and presented a sword. It was the practice of the Sahanu-Sahi to send a sword to a subordinate Chief whenever he was angry with the latter. This meant a sign of wrath and the recipient of the sword must kill himself with it, for otherwise the whole family would be annihilated by the overlord. Hence, when the sword was presented to the Sahi, Suri Kalaka observed a change in his friend's countenance and wanted to know the reason for his grief. When the matter was explained to the Suri, the latter advised the Sahi to escape from the tyranny of the overlord by migrating to the Hindukadesa with his friends, 95 in number, who also were ordered to be destroyed by the overlord. Kalaka thought that by this arrangement he could save his friend and punish the wicked king Gardabhilla. This marks the invasion of India by the Sākas. All the Sahis led by the Suri crossed the Indus and went to Surāstra and settled down there for some time. Then they were asked to take Ujjaini, the key to the splendid land of Mālava. But they complained that they had not enough supplies to undertake the campaign. The Suri obtained for them the sinews of war by working a miracle. He sprinkled a pinch of magic powder over a burning brick-kiln and turned the bricks into gold and said "Take this as your supplies". Thus equipped with supplies they set out for Ujjaini. Gardabhilla hearing of the approach of the enemies went out to meet them. As his army was routed in battle he hastily returned to his capital and stayed there with the remnants of his army prepared for a siege and depending upon his magic She-Ass. When this magic She-Ass brayed every biped or quadruped belonging to the hostile army within hearing would fall down,

vomiting blood. Therefore the Suri advised the Sahis to withdraw to a distance of two leagues, and he himself with 108 sharp-shooters waited for the appearance of the She-Ass. They were to stand alert, each with arrow drawn to the ear so that when the She-Ass opened her mouth to bray, her mouth should be filled with arrows before she could make a single sound. They did everything as planned. The magic She-Ass was thwarted. They entered the city and took Gardabhilla prisoner; he was brought in chains and offered at the Suri's feet. The nun Saraswati was liberated and the congregation was restored. The king Gardabhilla was banished from the country by the merciful Suri. The Sahi, the Suri's friend, was chosen as their overlord by the other Sahis. Thus arose the Saka line of Kings. They ruled happily the land of Malawa, honouring the teaching of Jinas and being disciples of the great Suri till they were uprooted by Vikramaditya who became the king of Malawa. He established his own era called the Vikrama Era beginning with 58–57 B. C. When 135 years of the Vikrama Era had elapsed, this line was in its turn destroyed by a powerful Saka king who established his own Era—the Saka Era—(78 A. D.)

This is the first and the most important episode of Kalaka's career. The second relates to the events at the city of the kings Balamitra and Bhānumitra and of the change of the date of Paryushana, and the third relates to his reproof of Sagaradatta; the fourth to his expounding the *Nigoda* doctrine. Professor Brown is of opinion that the episode relating to the change of Paryushana date is probably the last to be included in the Kalaka legend. There are various recensions of the Kalaka legend and some of these are published in this volume. Further the stories associated with Kalaka are not "confined to a single person, but relate to three, who are separated from one another by appreciable periods of time". Prof. Brown emphasises this as a very important fact and he criticises Mr.

Jayaswal that "he nowhere distinguishes between the three Kalakas". He agrees with Prof. Konow as to the value of the Kalakacarya Kathanaka of the Jinas for he quotes with approval Prof. Konow's opinion as to the tradition.

I cannot see the slightest reason for discrediting this account, as is usually done, because most scholars are a priori disinclined to believe in Indian tradition and sometimes prefer the most marvellous accounts of foreign authors to Indian lore. Almost every detail can be verified from other sources. A Saka Empire in the Indus country is known from classical sources. Ptolemy speaks of the extension of Saka power to Kathiawar and the use of the imperial title "King of Kings" among the Sakas, is attested by coins. And the Puranas speak of "Saka Kings" as the successors of the Gardabhilla dynasty.

The history of the first Saka Empire in India can accordingly be reconstructed as follows: Shortly after the death of Mithradates II in 88 B. C. [The Sahanusahi of the Kalaka legend] the Sakas of Seistan made themselves independent of Parthia and started on a career of conquest which took them to the Indus country. ... Later on, about 60 B. C. Sakas had extended their domain to what the Kalakacarya Kathanaka calls Hindukadesa, i.e., the lower Indus country, and thence to Kathiawar and Malawa, where they probably introduced their national era. In 57–56 B. C. they were here ousted by Vikramaditya, who celebrated his victory by establishing an era of his own.....

On this array of evidence, Prof. Brown suggests:—

We may accept the tradition of Saka invasion of the lower Indus country, Kach, Surat, and Malwa, with the capture of Ujjaini, until evidence is adduced to contradict it. The fact that the legend contains fairy-tale elements need not make us reject its kernel.

The texts after recounting the defeat of Gardabhilla refer to the establishment of the Vikrama Era in 57 B. C. and to the restoration of the Saka ascendancy marked by the Saka Era in 78 A. D. It is a pity that Prof. Brown does not want to discuss the origin of these two Eras, for he is of opinion that it is "impossible to extract any solid information on these eras from our texts". In a footnote he explains why he does not accept the conclusions obtained by K. P. Jayaswal. The matter is of such vital importance to historical research that it



appears quite unfair to dismiss it in a footnote.

Though this is not the place to discuss the problems of the eras, still we need make no apology for stating the salient points in Jayaswal's position. He agrees with Konow on many points. But as to the date of "the Earlier Saka Era" he differs from him. Dr. Konow puts the origin after the reign of Mithradates II, *i. e.*, after 88 B. C., "when the power of Parthia had declined and kingdoms once subordinate had become independent". But according to Jayaswal, who relies on the Kalakacharya story, the invasion was due to pressure at home; it was not due to the weakening of the Suzerain power; but to its crushing weight which could not be borne. Whether we take the successful revolt against Artabanus and the national self-assertion of the Sakas or the migration due to the tyranny of Mithradates II as marking the national Era, it will not be far off from 123 B. C.

Another interesting point to be noted is Jayaswal's identification of Vikramaditya with Gautamiputra Satakarni. He accepts Dr. Konow's conclusion that Vikramaditya of 58 B. C. was a historical figure and a national hero. The Jaina chronology connects the Saka defeat in 58 B. C. with Gautamiputra.

The Jaina chronological gathas if properly understood have yielded almost accurate chronology and history. Their date for Nāhapāna and Vikrama or Gautami Satakarni is one of the best contributions of that chronology.

Let us turn to the second section

*The Jewish Foundation of Islam.* By CHARLES CUTLER TORREY. (Jewish Institute of Religion Press. Block Publishing Co., New York. \$ 1, 50).

Many theories have been advanced by European Orientalists to account for the phenomenon of the Qur'ān—almost as many as were put forward by opponents in the Prophet's own day.

dealing with art—miniature painting in Western India. The reproductions are not confined to the Kalakacharya-MSS. paintings. The illustrations are arranged according to the chronological order—first the reproduction from palm-leaf manuscripts and then from paper manuscripts. The former consists of three plates and the latter, seven, altogether ten plates. Important incidents from the Kalaka legend illustrated in the paintings reproduced in this book are:—

Kalaka — as prince on horseback.  
Kalaka — hearing Gunakara preach.  
Abduction of the nun Saraswati.  
King Gardabhilla in court.  
Kalaka and the Sahi.  
The Siege of Ujjaini and defeat of the She-Ass.  
Gardabhilla — a captive.  
Kalaka and Indra.

In the second chapter devoted to the history of miniature paintings Prof. Brown has contributed in a short chapter a useful history of the "Western Indian School" of art—which is of great importance in the history of Indian painting. In these miniatures of the Kalakacharya Katha we see the first small intrusion into Indian painting of Persian elements. Gradually the Persian influence upon the Indian style became more and more felt until the "combination of the two brought into existence the Rajaput and Mughal schools".

Prof. Brown can very well claim that "no one but myself has yet endeavoured to outline even tentatively, the history of this Art". He deserves to be congratulated for the splendid edition of this story of Kalaka.

A. CHAKRAVARTI

Formerly it was treated as imposture—a theory which has not been able to withstand the ordeal of research. But until now the abundant historical details found in Islamic Tradition have been accepted as authoritative. It has been left for Dr. Torrey, Professor of Semitic languages in Yale University, to reject the whole of the

available historic data and, on the total void thus created, to launch a new and staggering hypothesis, which is that the Prophet was, if not a learned rabbi, at least profoundly versed in rabbinical lore, which he had studied in "the Israelite colony in Mekka".

We have not the slightest evidence, historical or traditional, of the existence of an Israelite colony in Mecca at any time, nor have we record of a single Jewish resident. On the other hand, tradition tells us that, when the Meccan disbelievers wished to annoy the Prophet with posers on the kind of subjects about which he preached to them, some of them went to Yathrib (Al-Madinah), the nearest place at which there was a Jewish colony, and got the rabbis there to prime them with conundrums which they propounded to the Prophet on their return; the revealed answers to which are contained in Surahs XVII and XVIII and also (I think) in Surah XXVII (the story of Solomon and the ants and the Queen of Sheba)—passages which stand in contrast to the rest of the Qur'ān and are entirely rabbinical.

The Prophet's known and reported intercourse with Christians led the Meccans in his day to think that he had learnt from them—a claim made by the Christian Arabs and supported by the great majority of Orientalists. But Prof. Torrey finding—as he states—in the Qur'ān only a very superficial knowledge of Christianity (he seems to have ignored the Gnostic version), but a profound knowledge of Judaism, cannot accept the facts as handed down to us.

The author insists too much upon the evidences of direct borrowing from Jewish sources, which he thinks he finds in the Qur'ān itself, and forgets altogether the strong Jewish influence which we know to have been exercised on Muslim interpretation of the Qur'ān in early days. The Arabs, wishing for elucidation of certain passages and further information with regard to Hebrew prophets, turned naturally to the

Jewish convert for an explanation, which in many cases changed the import of the text. For example, in the story of Joseph, Prof. Torrey writes:—

Thereupon follows the attempt of the man's wife to entice Joseph . . . . Joseph refused at first, but was at last ready to yield when he saw a vision which deterred him. (The nature of this is not told in the Koran, but we know from the Jewish Midrash that it was the vision of his father with Rachel and Leah).

There is no mention of a vision in the Qur'ānic account of the incident:—

And she, in whose house he was, asked of him an evil act. She bolted the doors and said: Come! He said: Allah forbid! He is my lord who hath treated me honourably. Wrong-doers never prosper.

She verily desired him, and he would have desired her if it had not been that he saw the argument of his lord. Thus it was that We might ward off from him evil and lewdness. Lo! he was one of our chosen slaves.

Here the word "lord" (*rabb*) in both cases refers to Joseph's absent master. The same word is used in the same Surah with reference to the King. Elsewhere in the Qur'ān the word (*rabb*) is applied only to Allah. It was thus easy for the Jewish exponent, in all good faith, to put in his Hebrew legend at this point as explaining the nature of "the argument of his Lord," though the text of the Qur'ān implies no more than Joseph's foreseeing what his master, who had treated him most kindly, would have the right to think of him in certain circumstances.

The author fails to note the difference in the Qur'ānic narration of the old Semitic stories, though they are noteworthy. There is no snake in the story of the fall of Adam; the Flood is for the destruction of "the folk of Noah" only, not of all mankind: Lot's wife is not turned into a pillar of salt, but simply "left behind" in the doomed township. The narrative parts of the Qur'ān were given for instruction and warning, to make a strong impression on an audience which delighted in the marvellous and the grotesque. How, then, was so much of the marvellous and all the grotesque omitted from the narratives if these were taken whole-



sale, as the author thinks, from Hebrew Scriptures?

One cannot help perceiving that Prof. Torrey could never have evolved his theory, much less developed it, if he had studied Muslim Scripture and

Tradition as closely as he has studied Jewish. As it is, these lectures, delivered before the Jewish Institute of Religion, New York, must rank among the curiosities of Orientalism.

MARMADUKE PICKTHALL

*Religion and History.* By JAMES CLARK MCKERROW, M. B. (Longmans, Green and Co., London. 6s.)

Dr. McKerrrow's book comprises two separate essays, entitled respectively, *Principles of Sociology* (73 pp.) and *Evolution in the Light of Religion* (113 pp.) It is particularly difficult to do justice to the first of these essays in a brief review, for the author, whose style is not of the easiest, has compressed into his 73 pages a vast amount of varied fact, comment and speculation about the evolution of social institutions and social consciousness, past and future. Many of his conclusions are highly controversial, but it is clear that they have been arrived at as the result of wide reading and reflection on what he has read. Like nearly everyone else in the modern world, Dr. McKerrrow is a strong advocate of peace; but he appears to think that war can be abolished by a sort of act of the general reason, failing to recognise that, so long as the vast majority of men as individuals continue to pursue selfish aims, so long will conflict be endemic in the human race, and will break out at intervals in one form of violence or another. Selfishness and lack of emotional control are the diseases of which war is one of the symptoms; and in sociology, as in medicine, a real permanent cure can be effected only by removing the causes of the trouble.

In his second essay Dr. McKerrrow propounds an exceedingly interesting and, we believe, original theory of Christian origins. Christianity, he holds, made its first appearance as Gnostic Christianity, which arose latish in the first century A. D. as

the result of the infusion of Jewish messianic ideas into Gnosticism, which was an eclectic system or movement springing out of the whole religious past of the Western world. Among the Gnostic Christians, whose hey-day was roughly from 70-135 A. D., there was, as elsewhere, a division into "full-grown men and babes"; and the Christ, which was understood by the first as a divine saviour-principle, was given an historical embodiment by the second and identified with Jesus. From this externalised Gnostic Christianity of the spiritual "babes" was gradually developed Catholic Christianity, of which, Dr. McKerrrow insists, there is no evidence at all in history prior to about 140 A. D. Our author thus entirely reverses the orthodox theory, which makes Gnosticism an heretical movement that diverged from primitive Catholicism. He holds no strong view either way as to the historicity of Jesus, but contends that his theory will hold good whether the gospel narrative be regarded as history or as myth. Of that narrative, he writes:—

The New Testament is the expression of the writers' religious experience; it conveys spiritual, not historical truth, and no one with ears to hear the former will care about the latter.

Dr. McKerrrow has given us only the bare outline of his theory, for which however he makes out a case which is at least plausible and suggestive. We venture to hope that he will work it out in fuller detail in a future book, and meet by anticipation some of the many counter-arguments that will certainly be advanced on the orthodox side.

R. A. V. M.

## THE SECOND QUARTER OF 1934 IN THE U. S. A.

*The End of a Season—The Scholar in Politics—Philosophy for Modern Man—A New Synthesis—"New York Intellectuals"—Music in American Life—Thomas Mann—His Olympian Detachment.*

In London and Paris the "season," artistic and intellectual as well as social, is still at its height in June. Not so in New York. Short periods of terrific heat in a temperate zone affect the inhabitants more than they do those of more tropical regions. By the end of May the season here in the theatre, in publishing, in education, is almost over. Only music has of late years come to have a vital summer incarnation. There is a two months season of open air concerts by the New York Philharmonic Orchestra that has become one of the remarkable features of summer life in New York.

One good way of noting the signs of the times intellectually is to note the things that are said by distinguished university presidents at the Commencement (or Graduation) ceremonies of our leading universities. Some of these pronouncements, it is true, tend to be routine, but even the routine is symptomatic. The leaders in American academic society have a rather special place in our civilization. They are a kind of lay priests and public prophets. Some of them, like Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, have for a generation spoken to a wide public attention. The older order of university presidents is passing away; Dr. Butler is

indeed the only survivor. But younger ones, Hutchins of Chicago, Conant of Harvard, Angell of Yale, are beginning to acquire something of the same authoritative status.

As one looks over the Commencement addresses this year, there is, it must be confessed, very little new or striking to report. Dr. Butler contented himself with pleading once more for the nineteenth-century ideal—or idol—of liberty which he thinks threatened by the increasing socialization of American and of European life. Some university orators urged for the importance of trained intelligence in American political life, a plea as old, of course, as Plato, but rendered particularly timely by arguments pro and con as to the competence and service rendered by the so-called "brain trust," a group of university economists and legal professors high in the councils of the Roosevelt Administration. On this theme President Roosevelt himself had vigorous things to say at the Yale Commencement, where he received an honorary degree. The President stands firmly by his professorial adjutants, and not Woodrow Wilson, himself a scholar and professor, could more firmly have defended the scholar in politics.



There have been no new books of the first order, though there have been three or four extremely important as symptoms. One of those is a volume\* by Richard Rothschild, a non-professional, self-avowed but earnest amateur in philosophy. His book *Illusion and Reality* is, for all its scholarly limitations, a really significant contribution. It breaks no new ground but it traverses ground only recently broken. It is an attempt to make a philosophy for modern man. The author, whose identity and history are unknown to me, is obviously particularly influenced by that group of recent thinkers, including Eddington and Whitehead, who find inadequate the measurable facts of physics, and the whole biological theory of "Reality," made so popular, especially in France, Germany, and America in the late nineteenth century. Whitehead has made clear, as also Mr. Rothschild, that an adequate knowledge would include—as an adequate theory of knowledge would have to include and as an adequate metaphysics would have to deal with and render—values as well as facts, ideals as well as things. A complete philosophy would have to include the moral as well as the physical order. Spirit, too, is a fact, and a philosophy that attempts to give the meaning of things and to ignore the fact of meaning, is a false philosophy indeed. Mr. Rothschild is to be commended for his attempt to indicate the general outlines of a philosophy that would incorporate moral and spiritual as well as

physical "facts" into its vision of a "coherent" reality. The time is obviously passing when billiard-ball physics was the dogma and the superstition of the supposedly enlightened and when the physics laboratory was the unconscious temple of a new and narrow theology of matter.

There is another book that deserves mention in something like the same connection. It is called *The Horizon of Experience* by C. Delisle Burns, a humane and cultivated writer on philosophical themes of a broadly moral type and interest. The book has, as a matter of fact, not attracted very much attention here. It is a little too obvious for the trained student, and possibly too advanced for anyone but the already quite well educated layman. It is a pity, for I have not in a long time seen a volume that combined a more decent and understanding respect for the past and a sense of the new horizons opened up by experiments in art, education, and politics and personal life and the new doctrines of physics. Professor Burns points out the oscillation in intellectual history between periods of intellectual synthesis when, as among the Greeks, and in the Middle Ages, there was a fixed synthesis in the light of which experience was regarded, and those periods, like those of the Renaissance and our own, when the materials of a new synthesis were beginning to appear on "the

horizon and in the midst of the debris of the old".

There is still another book, in no explicit sense philosophical, that, though by no means a masterpiece, has significance as a peculiarly accurate symptom of some of the *malaise* specific to American intellectuals. It is called *The Unpossessed*. It is by a young writer named Tess Slesinger. It has attracted considerable attention among the metropolitan critics, and is a discomforting picture of the neurotic "young intellectuals" in New York during the last few years. These young men and women in Miss Slesinger's novel are "unpossessed" by anything. They have no roots and no traditions, for they question all traditions, and deny all roots. They are full of the latest verbal clichés about revolution and the new society, but they are engaged in talk rather than in revolution, and in words far more than in ideas. There is a kind of "heartbreak house" atmosphere about the book for it is written with compassion. There is the romantic irony of a wit that perceives the illusions of its own loves and ideals. These young rootless people are looking for something, they know not what, and are sceptical of everything no matter what. The talkative being, the repressed New Englander and his wife denied a child, the weak and sensitive student and the brasher Six Black Sheep eager for the Revolution, the Park Avenue (the New York Mayfair) hostess and patron of literary and revolu-

tionary movements—all these are strikingly etched. But the book has a deeper point, a point possibly deeper than the one the author intended and certainly not explicitly made by her. There is probably not a city in the world where there is a group quite resembling the New York "intellectuals". They are the group to be met at literary teas and at semi-literary, semi-political symposia. They are not at ease in a society given over so largely to non-intellectual matters. They are not at ease really in the intellectual life. They have no such long tradition to feel nourished by, as the intellectual class in Europe and the Orient. And they are naturally taken up with every new wind of doctrine that comes along. Of late the fashionable thing among the intellectuals has been Revolution, though, as one of the characters in *The Unpossessed* points out, none of them would know a real working man if they saw one, or, one may add, be understood or known by the latter. What bedevils most of them, too, is a sense of sophisticated doubts of their hopes and aspirations. They are unconsciously haunted by the echoes of a materialistic psychology and theory of nature that they do not realize has ceased to be authoritative among scientists.

And finally while they describe themselves as intellectuals there is not in them the inner peace that makes for contemplation or, since the depression, the economic security that would help to make it possible. Miss Slesinger is to be

\* Reviewed in our last issue.



thanked for making the picture of this group so vivid. She has made clear also how little genuine contemplation goes on in much that passes for the intellectual life in this Western metropolis and how provincial and nineteenth-century much of its intellectual life is.

In an earlier letter, I had occasion to remark on the peculiar place music has in the life of America. The wireless has of course had much to do with making it available. But the passion for music in this country is coming to be a really extraordinary phenomenon. One of its interesting manifestations is in the summer concert series, already referred to, of the New York Philharmonic, which in an open air stadium, under distinguished conductors, plays nightly through our very hot summer season, to audiences of eight thousand or more. The opening programme consisted more than half of Beethoven. There is no concession to popular taste, for popular taste in music in this city is very high.

One of the striking features of the life of mind and imagination in this country is its colonialism to Europe. There is, of course, a rich and growing American tradition,

but part of the American tradition is its hospitality to the best that has been said and thought in the world. This is especially evident on those occasions when a distinguished foreign writer or thinker comes to these shores. Recently Thomas Mann, the great German novelist, now a voluntary exile from his own country, came for a brief visit to these shores. He was greeted with a large testimonial dinner at which many of the most distinguished writers and educators in the country were present. One of the great appeals of Mann to readers in this country is his Olympian detachment, his universal human sympathies and his sense of a spirit more deep than words, more permanent than time, more significant than fact and matter, which seems to inform life and the cosmos. His novel, *The Magic Mountain*, an allegory (laid in a tuberculosis sanitarium) of the whole mind of pre-war Europe and the whole decay of materialistic nineteenth-century European civilization, has gradually attained a wide popularity here. He is one of the few minds in the West that sees through the West altogether, and through its favourite dogmas and presumptions.

IRWIN EDMAN

## CORRESPONDENCE

### LIFE AND PHILOSOPHY

Dr. R. Naga Raja Sarma has been doing some useful work with regard to Indian Philosophy. He has revealed the value and significance of some ancient Hindu doctrines, which had not received sufficient attention from modern scholars. He is also trying to make Hindu philosophy a living factor in the present-day life of the Hindus. Being a vital thinker, he expresses his views forcibly but sometimes falls into exaggeration. Delivering the inaugural address at the Philosophical Association of Pachaiyappa's College (*The Hindu* 10th August), he made some observations which call for notice. His subject was: "What is Living and What is Dead in Indian Philosophy". The mark of living philosophy, according to him, is its power to influence the conduct of the people. He seems to hold that indigenous philosophy is the best philosophy for every nation; that Indian philosophy has not influenced the West at all and that the Darsanas are a dead weight upon the Hindu mind of to-day.

If the West earnestly requires spirituality Dr. Sarma thinks that Christianity is sufficient for the West and the Vedantic inspiration is superfluous. "Even so, the Darsanas and the Vedanta were quite sufficient for the satisfaction of the deepest spiritual demands of the Hindus." This sounds like preaching a kind of spiritual insularism. In the universe of Spirit, physical geography is eminently meaningless. Buddhism which was born in India has prospered much better in China and Tibet. Even Christianity, purified of all its churchianity, will not be "sufficient" for the West. It needs to be supplemented by the Wisdom of the East. A comparative study of religions should make it clear that no one religious system can satisfy fully the inner needs and

aspirations of the human mind. Religion which "transmutes the apparently base metal of every ritualistic and dogmatic creed (Christianity included) into the gold of fact and truth"\* can alone meet the situation. Dr. Sarma's insularism will feed religious pride and selfishness. This attitude might bring in once more an era of crusades. International contact is growing both in extent and intensity and if religious egotism is encouraged it will only fan the flame of mutual enmity and distrust. "Religious Patriotism," as Prof. C. E. M. Joad describes this attitude, "which encourages each creed to flaunt the flag of its exclusive particularity in order the more effectively to damn its rivals, would be comic, if it were not for the volume of human suffering which it has entailed."

Is it, then, altogether beside the mark... to suggest that the only way to transcend the legacy of hatred, bigotry and conceit... is to abolish the creeds; the only way to make man religious, to eliminate religions?" (*Is Christianity True?* p. 321).

A return to Religion *per se* will solve the problem and this cannot be found in any single creed like Christianity. In all aspects of human life, the law of Interdependence holds good.

Dr. Sarma calls it "the merest moonshine" to hold that the West has received spiritual inspiration from India, during the last twenty-five years and more. This may be true so far as the research scholars are concerned. But as a matter of historical fact, attention may be drawn to the work of H. P. Blavatsky who was the first to introduce the West, in the right spirit, to the Eastern lore. She was Eastern Wisdom in flesh; she lived and died for the cause of its vindication. The spirit of Indian Philosophy as incarnated in *The Secret Doctrine* by Madame Blavatsky has influenced Western life and thought to a degree not yet within the

\* H. P. Blavatsky. *Is Theosophy a Religion?* U. L. T. Pamphlet No. 1, p. 4.



pale of recognition by scholars.

With regard to the Indian metaphysical systems or *Darsanas*, Dr. Sarma's view is correct. The *Darsanas* have ceased to influence the conduct of the people; the little influence they have is either of dogmatic or of unenlightened kind. The Pandits, of course there may be exceptions, have reduced to philosophical dogmas what were originally living spiritual perspectives. The mass mind, on the other hand, shows up the Darsanic influence only to its disadvantage; lacking the living intellectual basis this teaching has become a sort of mental ritual which is more harmful than the outer. Dr. Sarma's exhortation to study the original Sanskrit *Darsanas* is good, but without the necessary key such study might only add to the dead matter of word scholarship.

Kethi

D. G. V.

#### TIME AND SUBJECTIVITY

Apropos of the thoughtful editorial footnote to Mr. L. A. G. Strong's article on Reincarnation, on page 484 of the August number of THE ARYAN PATH, I am puzzled a good deal by the observation made therein, namely,

We must not overlook that the condition of the soul after death is entirely *subjective* and therefore it has no knowledge of the passage of time.

It is one of the axioms of Vedantic philosophy that "Aham" and "Idam," the subject and object of knowledge, cannot be conceived of as existing separately from each other. "Entirely subjective," therefore, appears to involve some element of contradiction. If, even, the expression has been used in a relative sense only and intends to convey that the soul's conception of time "after death" is entirely different, as in the dream-state, then also it is difficult to follow. Is one's consciousness of time during the waking hours really so "entirely different" from that during the dream-state? The difference that there is, is only of degree and not of kind.

The development of the sense of

time in human beings has been the work of evolution. In the savage it is far less developed than in his civilized brother. Among the civilized themselves time-sense differs in accordance with their national and cultural peculiarities. Time passes much "quicker" with the hustling American than with the lotus-eating Chinese or the Hindu. The former is obsessed by his "precious" hours, minutes, and even seconds; everything around him is in a terrible flux, and new and ever new things confront him at every turn. The lotus-eater hardly notices how years and even ages pass by, for these do not affect his mode of life and bring little change into his surroundings. The consciousness of time in the dream-state is only a little more removed in degree than that of the lotus-eater—but in point of quality there is no difference, between the two.

As to our experiencing, in a moment of dream-state, events lasting hours and days, do not such things happen to us even in the waking state during our "brown studies"? Also, do we not lose time-consciousness when our attention is absorbed in any particular object? On the other hand, it cannot be contended that the time-consciousness is altogether absent in the dream-state. On careful analysis it should be found that the time-sense, in however vague a measure, does enter into the composition of our consciousness during the dream-state, and by analogy, during the post-mortem condition.

Taking all the circumstances into consideration, it appears to me that the editorial suggestion that the "soul after death has no knowledge of the passage of time" cannot be sustained in our present knowledge or rather ignorance of the exact pass to which it comes, after death. If Vedantic philosophy is any guide in this connection, it would appear that the entire elimination of the consciousness of time as well as of space can only come about in a state of *Mukti* or Self-realization.

Bombay

R. K. P.

## ENDS AND SAYINGS

"———ends of verse  
And sayings of philosophers."

HUDIBRAS.

The question "Who is a Christian?" has yet to be satisfactorily answered. The Dean of Durham, Dr. C. A. Alington, writes in *The Daily Telegraph* of August 4th, that "there is nothing to be gained by calling people 'Christian' who themselves definitely reject the membership of the Christian Church". But this restriction of Dr. Alington is perhaps rather for the sake of convenience and clarity than to uphold a narrow outlook. For the Dean admits with astonishing broadmindedness, and has evidently pleasure in so admitting, the performance of Christian acts and the profession of Christian sentiments "by those who, for any reason, stand outside the Christian society". Dr. Alington's view of Shelley, of whom he writes sympathetically, is as astonishing from a Churchman as it is refreshing:—

It is permissible for a Christian to feel that he would rather stand at Shelley's side at the Day of Judgment than with many of his "respectable" contemporaries.

Religious thought in Christendom is taking many strange forms in these days; one of them is the proposed new German-Religion. In formulating this new religion the leaders of advanced religious thought in Nazi Germany offer an improvement on the worship of the State and its heroes of the St.

Lenin school and, it must be admitted, an improvement, no less, upon effete orthodoxy. A curiously anomalous situation presents itself: Protestant orthodoxy is resisting political domination while the forces working to break the moulds of orthodox thought are playing into the hands of a Government more autocratic than the Church itself.

Disregarding the menacing political possibilities of any ardently embraced State cult, much of what the leaders of the German-Nordic Faith Movement are promulgating certainly comes closer to the basic principles of the once universal Wisdom-Religion than does the churchianity it would supplant. This is apparent from the catechism, *Die 25 Thesen der Deutsch-Religion*, recently published by Prof. Ferdinand Hirt of Leipzig University, a leader in the movement for a new national faith. It denies having dogmas or being based on "revelation". It repudiates the idea of an extra-cosmic God:—

God is a moral idea, which we recognise in the eternal creative power of nature working in the world and in man...

Within the being of God, alive in the world, the cognisant mind or spirit grows. Spirit is a thing which grows naturally in this world of reality. It does not exist in perfection at the beginning, but is the ripe fruit of the world's development at the end...